

Lately Published,
*Agrippa almost persuaded
to be a Christian :*

O R, T H E
Self-Condemn'd Quaker.

B E I N G

A true Copy of Two Papers lately Printed by
Thomas Beaven, in relation to the *Quakers*.
With a Preface; and some Reflections on
the last of them, Entituled, *His Second
Thoughts*.

By *BOHUN FOX*, L. L. B. Vicar of *Melkesham*
in the County of *Wilts*, and late Fellow of *New-
College, Oxon*.

*For their Folly (and Falshood) shall be manifest unto all
Men, 2 Tim. 3. 9.*

L O N D O N,
Printed for *JOHN WYAT*, and Sold at *R. Warne's*
in *Chippenham*. 1707.

Lately Published,
*Agrippa almost persuaded
to be a Christian :*

O R, T H E
Self-Condemn'd Quaker.

B E I N G

A true Copy of Two Papers lately Printed by
Thomas Beaven, in relation to the *Quakers*.
With a Preface; and some Reflections on
the last of them, Entituled, *His Second
Thoughts*.

By *BOHUN FOX*, L. L. B. Vicar of *Melkesham*
in the County of *Wilts*, and late Fellow of *New-
College, Oxon*.

*For their Folly (and Falshood) shall be manifest unto all
Men, 2 Tim. 3. 9.*

L O N D O N,
Printed for *JOHN WYAT*, and Sold at *R. Warne's*
in *Chippenham*. 1707.

ad 10
THOMAS BEAVEN'S
VINDICATION

OF HIS
Second Thoughts

Relating to the

QUAKERS,
CONSIDERED.

BEING

An ANSWER to a late Pamphlet abusively
Entitul'd, *The High Priest of Melkesham, &c.*

By BOHUN FOX, L. L. B. Vicar of *Melkesham*,
in the County of *Wilts*, and late Fellow of *New-*
College, Oxon.

*Lo this is the Man that made not God his Strength, but
strengthened himself in his wickedness, Ps. 52. 7.
And thou shalt grope at Noon-days, as the blind gropeth in
Darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways.
And thou shalt become an Astonishment, a Proverb, and a
By-word among all Nations, Deut. 28. 29, 37.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for JOHN WYAT, at the *Rose* in *St. Paul's*
Church-yard, and Sold at *R. Warne's* in *Chippenham*.
1707.



i
r
M
j
a
v
I
v
th
th
d
d
sh
h
it
as

THOMAS BEAVEN'S
 VINDICATION of his
 Second THOUGHTS
 Relating to the
 QUAKERS,
 CONSIDER'D, &c.

THE Title-Page of the Pamphlet I am now considering, may not unfitly be compar'd to the *Bills* of some *Quack Doctors*; who tho' they are so Confident as to make *Infallible Promises*, are yet found by woful *Experience* to be meer *Cheats* in the Performance. I must confess, the Charge of Self-Contradictions could not but move me, it being so fresh in my Memory how my Adversary by that very Practice had justly brought himself into the last degree of Contempt; and tho' I was certain that mine, if I had any, could never be of so high and heinous a Nature as his, yet in reality I do still retain such an Horroir of his late Actions, that the very Name of Self-Contradictions made me eagerly turn to that part of his Work where he pretends to have discover'd them; which when I had done, I was presently convinced that this Writer was indeed a *True Quack*; forward to Undertake, and unable to Perform, as the Reader shall see in due Place. His giving me the Title of *High Priest of Melcham*, does not at all concern me, because such Language hurts no body but the *Giver*, unless it is due to him to whom it is *given*: a Caution which I here desire may be observed, as to what shall pass of this kind between me and this

B

Writer;

Writer; and so without any farther Ceremony, I dispose of my self to the Service of my Examiner.

It is a certain Sign of a desperate Cause, when the Defender of it is forc'd to begin with a wrong State of his Question: My Examiner would fain have us believe, that the Part he hath lately acted, is no more Disgraceful than that of Dr. South and Dr. Sherlock, or any two Persons of the same Communion, who shall enter into a Controversy with one another. The Reader I know will presently ask who then was his Antagonist? As to any private Differences which happened between a few of the Quakers and him, if they had been privately made up, the Publick would have taken no Notice of them: But since they could not be so ended, we have received lately two Papers from the Press, both of which are subscribed by Thomas Beaven Jun. The First, after much Consideration, and several Years Dissatisfaction, fully condemns the Quakers in many weighty Particulars; the last pleads as vehemently for them in those very Particulars. The Question then is, who in this Debate must sustain the Person of Dr. South? Why Thomas Beaven, Jun. and who that of Dr. Sherlock? Why the same Thomas Beaven, Jun. Why then (say I) this same Thomas Beaven, Jun. hath put a shuffling Trick upon us, in Multiplying himself at such a Rate, and in thinking to perswade us, that because the Upper and Lower House of Convocation have been at Variance, and Dr. South hath wrote against Dr. Sherlock, therefore by the same Parity of Reason, Thomas may write against Beaven: Yes doubtless the Case is exactly the same, and so we have nothing left to do, but to wish the Contending Parties a Happy Agreement. But if this will not pass, my Examiner is pleas'd to tell me, (for my Encouragement in Iniquity) that if I would do what he hath done already, I should act like a Man of Honour and Principle; tho' I must beg his Pardon, if I decline making the Experiment, because I am sure all Mankind besides will give me a Name of a quite contrary Nature: It would have pleas'd me better if he had made his Supposition of any other Person than my self, because I profess I tremble at the very Thoughts of it: I had rather he would suppose me Twenty Fathom under Water with a Millstone about my Neck. But as a Man is at Liberty to suppose any thing let it be never so wild and extravagant, I shall attend him to the End, and give him my Opinion. Ought I to be Angry (says my Examiner) if he should Print as well as talk against the Oppressions he thinks

thinks High Church is under, as greater than that of any other Society of Protestants? He does well to make a Difference between *Talking* and *Printing*, for indeed there is a great One, as this Writer hath by this time found to his Cost; nay there is a considerable Difference in *Talking*, for a Man may give his Judgment of a Controversy only in private Conversation, or he may take all publick Opportunities to vent and propagate his Notions; well, but how must I Print that High Church is oppress'd? why by the *Bishop of Canterbury's extending the Archiepiscopal Power and Privilege*: Now indeed if my Lord's Grace of Canterbury, is but a *bare Bishop*, it would undoubtedly be an Oppression in him to exercise an *Archiepiscopal Power and Privilege*; but I hope tho' my Examiner may suppose me to Print what he will, the Reader will not suppose me to *talk* so like an *Ignoramus*, even in private Conversation. Our Author is so fond of this Blunder, that he seems to have made it the Favourite of all his numerous Issue, and pleasures us with it *twice* in the Compass of a *single Page*. But he goes on, and that upon such his *Printing*, *Matters should be adjusted to his Satisfaction, and Occasion his signifying that amicable Agreement in Print, and induce him to censure the Digressions he might have made in his First, and the severe Lashes that in his Heat might drop from his Pen, too much to the general Prejudice of the Church, which before he might be dispos'd to leave.* What! leave the Church because the Upper and Lower House of Convocation cannot agree about *Adjournments*; that's a likely Supposition indeed! But to make the Case at all parallel, this Author's last Words (which are indeed *as soft as a Feather*, for fear they should hurt his own dear self) must be thus amended; and that upon such his *Printing*, he should be so void of Shame, as to retract in *Three Months time*, all he had affirmed, and signify it in Print by a Scandalous Recantation, and be induc'd to deny the Truths he had written in his First, by falsely suggesting they were the Effect of *Heat and Rashness*, tho' to his own *Self-Contradiction*. This Indeed would be vile enough, and yet this is not so vile as to reach the Case of my Examiner. For this Controversy is of such a Nature, as not to admit of an easie Decision; some of the Records relating to it were burnt, and the Practice of *Adjournments*, cannot so well be trac'd, by reason of the Paucity of Convocations, which have sat to do Business since *the Restoration*; and besides, the Cause of Religion is not immediately concerned in the Dispute.

I must therefore help my Examiner in a Supposition concerning my self, which he either could nor, or would not, make as he ought.

Let it be supposed then, for once, that I was a *Quaker*, and resolved to change my Religion; and should Publish to the World the Reasons which induc'd me to that Change: Should tell my *Quondam Friends* of their *Violation of the natural Right of Liberty of Conscience*, and in what Instance they did so; should declare their *Errour, in their Disuse of Water Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord with Bread and Wine*; should charge them with *Educating their Children in great Ignorance of the Christian Religion, and being in want of a Ministry prudently and Scripturally appointed*; should magnifie the *Hand of Providence, that had brought me to see his Light, that I might Honour him in renouncing their Errours, which for a considerable Time had lain before me with a single Eye, to the Glory of God*; and declare my Self bound in Conscience, because of their Errours, to leave their *Communion*: And yet after all these solemn Declarations, should presently appear again in Print, and unsay what I had said: Should think to put my Reader off, with the Pretence of being *Blind and out of my Sences* when I wrote my *First Paper*; but full of renewed *Light* when I wrote my *Second*; and upon such a Ridiculous Foundation contradict my self in almost every Particular, and join Hands with my *Quondam Friends* again. Should I act so foul a Part in the *Sacred and Important Business of my Religion*, ought my Examiner to be Angry with me? No certainly, because he hath done the same himself: But the Question is, what all Mankind besides would think both of me and my Performance? And because I may have the Liberty of speaking freely in my own Case; I do publickly declare, that if they would be so Charitable as to *beg me for a Fool* I should be heartily thankful; but if they were resolv'd to conclude me a *Knave*, I would never pretend to say one Word in my Defence, but retire from the Conversation of all that know me, and never set Foot upon my native Soil again: And I must tell this Writer, that tho' he holds up his Head so high, and Blusters after such a Manner, he hath fix'd such an *Indelible Stain* upon his Reputation, as he will never wipe off, tho' he should live to the *Age of Methuselah*.

As to his large and Inviting Offers, not to Return to the *Quakers*, I cannot imagine who should be so senceless to make them; but he had nothing it seems given or promis'd by
the

the Quakers to become their Friend again, and truly, I think, they had a *very hard Bargain* in him so, and that if they had occasion to part with him, they would find great Difficulty to put him off upon the same Terms.

When I read the beginning of my Examiners next Paragraph, I was surpriz'd to see what a dazzling Character he bestow'd upon me, far greater than I can deserve ; and as for his pretended Information in respect to *some Gentlemen whom I us'd to meet* ; it is not only *too wide of Truth*, but a downright Falshood : The lowest Seat in whose Company, I shall always account a Credit. But I find I am to make this considerable Figure for a little time, that his fancied *Victory* over me, may be the Greater : this is fulsome and nauseous, the Reader is certainly the proper Judge of that Matter ; and therefore I shall only put him in Mind of the wise Advice of the King of Israel, *1 Kings 20. 11, Let not him that girdeth on his harness, boast himself, as he that putteth it off.* I have known many a one as Sanguine as my Examiner, receive a Foil at last, and come off but Scurvily.

The greatest Part of his two next Pages, is to pass among his Digressions ; where he tells us we are *commanded to love one another* ; that *Charity excels in the Christian Religion* ; that he hopes to say enough in this Controversy, to *convince the Inspectious*, (a Word coin'd on purpose I suppose for those who are full of *renewed Light*) that the Inward Sence of the Holy Ghost *Enlightning Converting and Sanctifying the Soul*, is to be preferr'd before the *Decrees of Councils and Determinations of Expositors* : that the Quakers have born a *blessed Testimony*, and to die in the Cause thereof, as many have done, *in nasty Holes and Dungeons*, is the *greatest Conquest and Glory*. Now I have heard indeed that some Quakers who have defrauded their Neighbours of their Dues, (as in the Case of Tyths) have (upon a legal Process) for their *Obstinacy and Fool Hardiness*, been committed to Goale, and some might happen to die, while they were there, for any thing I know to the contrary : But whether this be any *Conquest or Glory*, the Apostle will tell us, *1 Pet. 4. 15. Who says Let none of you suffer as a Thief, or as an evil doer.*

These Things being dispatched, which the Reader cannot but see do mightily relate to our present Controversy, my Examiner takes Heart, and turns himself to my *Dedication to the Justice.*

Whether the Words are *very hard*, to tell one in his Station,

tion, he acts in an *Insolent and unbecoming Manner*, who publishes to the World concerning any Gentleman of an *Unblemish'd Character*, that he hath done *disingenuously*, tho' he will not expose his Name at present, (which implies that he could expose it if he would) the Reader is left to determine; and whether my Words here quoted, are *too wide of Truth*, shall be considered, when we come to the supposed self Contradictions: Tho' how it could be a Doubt with my Examiner, (which no Body here doubted besides) whether Mr. *Selfe*, or another *Neighbouring Gentleman* reprinted his Paper, is past my Understanding: And they who will take his word in any Matter, are at Liberty to believe him in this if they please.

But he now professes a *Respect for the worthy Gentleman*. That's kind indeed! Quite another sort of Expression than we had before: I am glad I have been able to do some little good upon him, and shall the more easily bear the *Course Language* he gives to me, if I can but teach him a little *better Manners* to his Superiors.

I had said in my Dedication, that *I always covet to make it the Chief Design of my Studies to do good to others*: Which it seems put my Examiner in Mind of one *short Readment a Day*, call'd a *Sermon*, which I make to suffice at Melksham. Well! and can't a Man Study chiefly for the Good of Others, tho' he Preaches but once a Day at a Place? As to his decent Phrase call'd a *Short Readment*; if barely to Read be so great a Crime, a Prophane Scoffer may apply it even to the *holy Scriptures*, which we read to the People, as well as *Sermons*. For my own part, I do readily own, that I prepare what I design to speak, before I meet my Audience; and take in the best Helps I can, to make it (according to my Ability) *Sound, Edifying and Practical*: And indeed I think it a heinous Affront to the Holy Spirit of God, that any one should have the Impudence to amuse his Hearers with *Noise and Nonsense*, under the false Pretence of his *Dictates*; and make the Worship of God so *Scandalously Ridiculous*, as to draw several People to the Assembly, purely for their *Sport and Diversion*.

As to the Charge of *Covetousness* which he would fix upon me, the Thing answers it self to all that know the Case, nothing being more common, than for the Incumbent to serve the Church and Chappel of the same Cure.

Whether the *Bishop* relishes this or not, is more than he knows, for I dare say his Lordship never underwent the *Scandal of his Company* so long as to tell him so.

My

My Preface (he says) *hath so much of that called Envy and Ill-will against his Father and himself, that it deserves to be despised and loathed.* I desire it may be turn'd to, and then it will be seen whether there is the *least Reflection* upon his Father; and in reference to himself, it pinches him indeed in what an *honest Man* is more tender of than *his Belly*, I mean *his Integrity*: But that Place is wounded to such a degree, that he *loaths* the very thoughts of having it handled; and therefore acts prudently to *Despise*, what he is not able to *Answer*.

But I have *overshot my self at the Entrance of my Reflections*, which (says he) *seems omenous upon him, (that is, being put into sence, ominous to him.)* How then have I overshot my self? Why, by saying, That his *assigning the Re-printing and Dispersing his First Paper without his Order, as the Reason for the Publication of his Second Thoughts, was nothing but an empty Pretence.* I gave this Reason for that Saying; because his own Paper was sufficiently known to require a *Publick Reparation.* To this he Replies, That there was but about Twenty of those he Printed dispers'd, and they only here, where his Conversation, and Verbal Discourses, would have sufficiently Answer'd them. I must appeal to the Reader, as a Judge between me and this Writer: He dispers'd but about twenty, and they only here. If by *here*, he means *Melksham*, the Place from whence he Dates this Pamphlet, that's utterly False: But he would have sufficiently Answer'd them by *Verbal Discourses.* If he could, I would advise him to that Method for the future, for I am sure he hath not Answer'd them by Writing. And yet to make this possible, we must suppose, that the *twenty Papers* were kept very close in the Pockets of those to whom they were distributed, and neither *lent out*, nor so much as *talk'd of* in Publick. But does not my Examiner know, that they were handed about all round the Neighbourhood, and that the Country rung of his Performance? Is it not known, that some of them were lodg'd in an *Inn*, and a *Publick Coffee-house* at the *Devizes*, to be seen by all *Comers and Goers*? What therefore can be more ridiculous, than to talk of giving a sufficient Answer by Conversation? So that, after my Examiner's pretended Discovery, (which he introduces so pompously) that a Priest, and a High-Priest too, can *overshoot himself*; he hath in truth discover'd nothing, but that he is not able to see the Mark at which he is to *shoot*.

But now we are come to the very *Cream of the Jest*, no less than Seven Self-Contradictions ! For, (as my Examiner observes with his usual Shrewdness) *five and two* do certainly make up that Number. Before we begin, it may not be amiss to Observe to the Reader, Where Contradictions must be found, and How they may be discover'd. Now a Contradiction must always be found in *eodem Subiecto*; that is, it must be concerning the *same Persons or Things*; and it must be also something *said* of the *same Persons or Things in eodem Respectu*, in the *same Respect*. The short Rule by which these Contradictory Propositions are discover'd is this; that *one* of them must necessarily be *false*, and the *other true*. This being premised, enter now Self-Contradictions.

The First is, That I affirm in one place, *He hath no Reputation to lose*: And in another, concerning his Arguments for the Disuse of *Outward Baptism* and the *Supper*; That, *to do Justice to his Character, if the Case was not too plain to be puzzled, he hath gone as far in it as most Men before him*. Now if a Man of *no Reputation*, cannot go as far as most Men in *puzzling a Case*, then indeed this is a Contradiction: But I believe the Reader will be of Opinion, That they who endeavour to *puzzle plain Cases*, are for that very reason Men of *no Reputation*.

Enter Second Self-Contradiction! I had said, in my 4th Paragraph, that I was *afraid* the Reader will conclude, *there has been more of the Serpent than of the Dove in all this Management*. This (says my Examiner) is as if I was a *Cunning Fellow*. I add, or a *Wicked Fellow*, or *Both*: And yet in my 53d Page I say, That the *softest thing that could be said of him, would be, that he was out of his Wits*. Now (to let my Examiner put his own Construction upon my Words) may it not so happen, that a *Cunning Fellow* may, at one time or other, be guilty of *Folly*? Nay, hath it not so happen'd, (notwithstanding all his *Cunning*) in the Case of this Writer? The plain Answer then is, That though these Words are affirm'd of the *same Man*, they are not affirm'd of him in the *same respect*. Which likewise shews the Absurdity of his two next pretended Self-Contradictions. For, may not a Man manage one Argument, as if his *Understanding was quite broken*; and yet when he comes to another, endeavour to *put a Trick upon us* in the Management of that? Or, may not he Argue so wretchedly in one place, as if he was *forsaken by common Sense*? and yet in a *different place* try to give us a *Slight of his Hand*? That these

these things are Consistent, we may gather from my Examiner's own Confession, who says, *p. 54, 55.* That he was *darkened in his Mind* when he wrote his First; nay, was in such *Confusion and Disorder of Mind*, that he *knew not what he did.* And yet 'tis most certain, (as he hath managed the Matter) he put such a *Slight of Hand upon himself*, in Printing that *First Paper*, as he can never get over, with all his Art, and *renew'd Light.* My next Contradiction lies (as he says) in affirming, That if the *rest of the World* should use it, (Human Learning) like this Author, all *Ingenious* (he should say, *Ingenuous*) Men, (my wise Examiner does not know the difference between those two Words) would loath and abhor it. It seems (says he) *Ingenious Men don't belong to the World.* Yes, (say I) they do; and yet the *rest of the World* may be call'd the *World* too, though they are but a *part of it*, by an usual way of speaking: so very usual, that it hath not escaped the Notice of my Examiner, who mentioning, in his *First Paper*, the *great Ignorance of the Christian Religion in which the Quakers Children are educated*, and his proposing divers Times, that some *Christian Catechisms* should be prepared for them; but that (says he) *is so much like the World*, (as you uncharitably call all other Christians but your selves) that I could never get Friends to Concur therein. Where he justly charges the Quakers with *Uncharitableness*, for calling all other Christians but themselves (in Contempt) the *World*, but not with *Contradiction*; and indeed, such a Charge had been Absurd and Ridiculous —

Another of my Self-Contradictions lies, it seems, in my telling the Justice, That he (my Examiner) had *Expos'd his Name*, though he did not directly mention it. But where did I say any thing like it? So far is it from that, that I did, and do still think, it is not in his power to Expose any one but himself; and this he hath done, indeed, with a Witness. My Words then are, That he hath *assum'd the liberty of his Name*, in a very Insolent and Unbecoming manner; which though it is not directly mention'd, is sufficiently pointed out to all about him. And pray, where is the Contradiction? Do not the last Words plainly declare how the first are to be understood? There are several ways of using a Man's Name, without putting down the Numeral Letters. If I should reflect upon the *Glorious Hero*, who is raising a Noble Structure call'd *Blenheim-House*; would it not be the same thing; and should I not be as liable to a Prosecution, as if I had said the *Duke of Marlborough*?

Borough? But because a nearer Instance may sink deeper into this Writer's Head, I will try if I can Convince him by that: Suppose then I should say of a Neighbour of mine, That he had lately *lost all his Reputation*, by an Open and Publick Prevarication in Things of the Highest Moment; by blowing *Hot and Cold* almost in the *same Breath*, and Printing both *for and against* the *same Subject*: Such a blessed Neighbour I have, (whose Name at present I shall not Expose) and yet I can't but fanſie, I have taken *such a liberty of it*, that though it is not *directly mention'd*, it is so *sufficiently pointed out*, as to enable any one hereabouts to know him, who hath Sense enough to distinguish his *Right Hand* from his *Left*. And if every part of this be Truth, I am sure it can be no Contradiction to affirm it.

My Last Self-Contradiction is to be found (as he says) in these Words: *To consult the Scriptures, and draw out from thence a full and impartial Account of this Matter. Alas, this is none of his Business!* And yet I observe, p. 43. Our Author would have you believe, he is giving you a full Account of this Matter, out of the New Testament, in the following Pages. From whence it is *inferred* by him, that this was *some of his Business*. Now this is so far from being a Contradiction, that both the Passages affirm only the *same thing*. The *first* says, That to give a full Account of this Matter out of the Scriptures, is none of his Business: The *last*, That he would have you believe, he is giving you a full Account of this Matter out of the New Testament. But though he endeavours to *impose this Belief upon you*, 'tis evident, he designs *no fair or full Account*; that being, in reality, *none of his Business*. His Business is only to *Juggle and Deceive*; and therefore I immediately subjoin'd, That *this is so awkwardly touch'd upon*, that it is plain, he is afraid to trust his Reader with what the Scriptures say concerning it. This then is so far from being a Contradiction, that it is nothing but plain *Matter of Fact*; for which reason, I was forc'd to draw out a clearer Narrative my self, out of the *Holy Writings*.

And now Reader let us stop a little and admire the *Ignorant Confidence* of my Examiner! A Charge of Seven self Contradictions, mark'd with *Black Letters* least they should escape Observation: Nay a Recantation publickly called for and yet when they come to be look'd into, not so much as *One* that will abide the Trial! *ex pede Herculem!* guess at the Man by this *Sketch* of his Performance;

mance ; the utmost that he hath prov'd is only this, That he doth not understand what a Contradiction is, and yet (strange as it is!) he falls roundly into them himself, by a wonderful Benefit of Nature ; tho' in earnest if I had been Guilty, I had rather he had found *Seven times Seven* such as these in my Book, than one such as he hath publish'd to the World in *His*. For I must make bold to inform him, that tho' all Contradictions are *alike* in a *Logical Sence*, yet they affect the *Reputation very differently* : Insomuch that the Author of them, may not only prove himself an *Ill Disputant*, but a *Canary Bird* into the Bargain. Whether this hath not been the very Case of my Examiner, is left to the Judgment of the Impartial Reader.

1st Of the Discipline of *Lavington* Monthly Meeting. Nothing is a truer Indication of Guilt, than to see a Man so Cautious and Reserv'd, that he cannot be brought so much as to Plead. My Examiner doth not intend to accept me for a Judge of the Particulars of their Agreement, (I must take Care of making it Particulars, for fear I should be corrected for not knowing how to Spell a Word after him) indeed I do not desire to be a Judge in any of his Controversies ; but he seems to forget, that he hath given the whole Kingdom, not only a Right of Judgment, but of Satisfaction in the Case before us, by the Publication of his first Paper. I am sure the Charge against some of the Quakers is very home and exprefs ; no less than a making Injunctions in direct Opposition to known Acts of Parliament, and recording as Hereticks those of their Members, who will not prostitute their Consciences to the Orders of these Inquisitors, enforcing the Non-payment of Tyths as a Capital Article of their Creed ; and from these Ill-grounded Scruples of Conscience, endeavouring to awe others into a Conformity ; so that if they had the Magistrate of their side (which God forbid !) they would Establish a Slavery and Bondage not Inferiour to that in the Romish Communion, nay even as the Case now is, who of their People can call his Soul his own ? When I first look'd into his Second Paper, I saw clearly that he only shuffled with his Reader, and endeavour'd to mince the Matter as much as he could. Whereupon in my Reflections I put these plain Questions ? Have they openly renounced these violent Proceedings ? have they Expung'd all the Particulars relating to them out of their Minutes ? and promis'd never to be guilty of such vile Impositions for the future ? If it be done, why is not the Publick inform'd of this ? But I may ask Questions as long as I please, he is resolv'd

resolv'd I shall have no direct Answer. Indeed his Case will not bear it, and therefore he must try how he can salve it up, by *Dodging* and *Shifting*. But doth he think, after his Accusation hath been so particular and important, the Reader is to be put off with such General and Evasive Terms, as that *their Reconciliation was upon a right understanding of one another, and a good Foundation of mutual Brotherly Love for the time to come.* In short, here is a plain Matter of Fact, of a very gross nature, fasten'd upon some of the Quakers; if it is true, all the Consequences that he charges it with, are true also: If it is false, it is as certain, when he writes next, he ought to make them a Publick Reparation in every particular; and not think to sculk and conceal himself, under general Phrases: If he doth not do thus much fairly and Openly, all discerning Persons will not, cannot, otherwise think; but that the Quakers charged by him so fully in his First, are really Guilty of Every Branch of his Accusation.

2d. Of Tythes.

We are now entring on the Disquisition of those Heads, where, if ever, we may expect what he promises in his Title Page, a *sober Vindication*. But the Reader will see that his *Railing* and his *Reason* are admirably suited, just as much of *Christianity* in the one, as there is of *Argument* in the other. The greatest Trouble that I shall have with him, will be, to rescue the Truth from his Perversions, and so to put the Matter in Debate upon a right Foot; to which end, it will be necessary,

First, to separate from the rest, all he hath Inserted, which does not belong to the Business in Dispute.

2dly, To show the Folly and Inconclusiveness, of what he hath offer'd in defence of himself; and then

3dly, To sum up the Arguments, that we may see where-in he hath been defective, and what is to be expected from him when he writes next.

In reference to the several Passages which he quotes out of my Book, as if I had attack'd him in a *Scurrilous manner*, I have only this to desire of the Reader: That if he is not already Convinced he deserves all that I have said and more; he would have recourse to the respective Pages, and see my Reason in applying those Passages to him; and then let any Indifferent Man blame me if he can: Many Persons have found fault with me for treating him

too Gently, but I never yet met with one Man, who tax'd me with *Severity*.

His calling upon me to purge my self of his Imputations in Relation to the Government, carries so much Malice in the Front of it, (especially since I have done it in the most *Sacred Manner* on so many *Publick Occasions*) that, as I value not what he thinks of me, so I shall venture the Venom of his Impotent Pen. And now I am upon this Head, I must likewise remind him, that all his Quotations out of Mr. *Lesly* are Foreign and Impertinent: The whole Tendency of his Book is to prove the *Divine Right* of Tyths; I as professedly decline that Argument: Can any thing therefore be more foolish, than to cite him, and then bid us agree in our Arguments; when it is plain, we do not write upon the *same Subject*? If Mr. *Lesly* hath Published any thing, which he believes to his Purpose, he may produce it in order to its being Considered; but he must not imagine, that I will give up a Point, because, he thinks he can quote another Person of a different Opinion. In short, the Argument that I have undertaken against my Examiner is this; That Tyths are due by the *Laws of this Kingdom*; and that to substract them from the *Lawful Owner*, is a manifest Act of *Violence and Injustice*. I had plainly warn'd him in my Reflections, pag. 31, not to amuse us in his third Thoughts, with the *Divine Right of Tyths*; foreseeing that he would take Refuge there, for want of something else to say; but they that think to tye him down to an Argument are mistaken, for I must shew an Authority deriv'd from *Christ and his Apostles* for my Maintenance, pag. 14. and again pag. 20. are their (*Hospital*) Rents required to be paid as a *Divine Right*? The Clergy of all Men, it seems, lye under this Misfortune, that the Laws of the Land cannot give them a sufficient Title to their Estates, unless they can prove it likewise out of the *New Testament*: But to come close to the Business in Hand. I will first briefly repeat my State of this Case in my Reflections, and then consider what my Examiner hath Replied to it. I affirm'd then, and prov'd, That a *Maintenance for them who preach the Gospel is plainly Comanded in the New Testament*: I observ'd afterwards, that our Ancestors had legally determin'd what this Maintenance should be; and that the Clergy have as good a Right to it as any other Man hath to his Estate: And then I considered his Three Objections, against their complying with the Laws, in this Particular.

His

His Answer begins with catching at a Piece of a Sentence in the bottom of a Paragraph, and overlooking what immediately precedes it, tho' it nearly concern'd him, to defend his own Practice, if he could, in refusing to pay his Tyths. for no other Reason than *Societies Sake*. But he takes notice, that I observ'd, what *a miserable Condition the Clergy would be in, were they to depend upon Charity*: And from hence, asks me, how I think the Ministers of other Denominations do subsist? My Answer is, I cannot tell; tho' I have heard, and I believe it is true, that (in the Country especially) they do not Abound. However, what the Church Clergy have, is *their own*, be it more or less; and, for that reason, greatly to be preferr'd, before *depending upon Charity*. But he comes afterwards nearer to the Point, and owns, with the Apostle, That those *who have sown spiritual things, may reap such carnal things, of those to whom they have sown spiritual, as are necessary for their Subsistence in this World*. So far then we are agreed; and this is all the Stress I laid upon the Words of St. Paul. So that his next Question is nothing but a running one Argument into another, on purpose to confound plain things, if he could. *Let my learned Antagonist tell me, (says he) by what Authority deriv'd from Christ, or any of his Apostles, he claims Wages, or Maintenance, from them to whom he hath not sown Spiritual things?* The Answer is ready; That my Argument doth not suppose a Title founded on an Authority deriv'd from Christ or his Apostles, but on the *Laws of this Kingdom*; and that I do not reap *his* Carnal things, but *my own*; to which I have as firm a Right, as he hath to any Carnal things he possesseth. And therefore, the true Question is, Whether, because his Conscience is *so tender*, that he cannot *sit under my Ministry*; he may therefore *Cheat me of a part of my Estate*; which the Law hath as clearly Vested in *me*, as his own Estate is Vested in *him*?

The next Step that he makes, is in support of his Three Reasons, why the Quakers can't in Conscience pay Tythes.

1st. Their Dedication is grossly Superstitious.

2^{dly}. They are required to be Paid, as an Act of Divine Worship.

3^{dly}. The Gospel doth not enjoin the Payment of Tythes at all, much less as a part of God's Worship.

To the last of these I Replied, That it is no reason at all: For the Question is not, Whether the Payment of Tythes be *enjoin'd* in the Gospel; but, Whether it is *forbidden*? If not, we are bound to *obey all Human Ordinances*

nances concerning them. My Examiner begs my Pardon, and tells me, I would put the Question wrong. Now I thought nothing could be plainer, than that we are to submit our selves to every Ordinance of Man ; to be subject not only for wrath, but also for conscience-sake : And that, if these Ordinances did not interfere with the Laws of God, we were bound to yield Obedience to them. But this (says my Examiner) is in Justification of an old Popish Notion, That all things are lawful in the Worship or Service of God, that are not forbidden : From whence the Papists plead for the Lawfulness of owning the Pope's Supremacy, Transubstantiation, &c. because the Scripture does not forbid these things. But this (say I) is a trick which some little Scribblers have got, when they meet with an Argument they can't tell what to do with, to cry out, Popery ! High-Church ! and Priestcraft !

They who have been conversant in the Popish Controversies, know, that the Method they take to prove the particular Points my Examiner mentions, is not only from there being not Forbidden, but Commanded in the Scriptures. As for Instance : The Pope's Supremacy, from that Text, among others, *Thou art Peter*, &c. Transubstantiation, from those Words, *This is my Body*, &c. And also from the Practice of the Primitive Church ; in both which, our Divines have unanswerably shewn them to be mistaken.

But let us suppose, tho' not grant, that the Papists do Argue for the Belief of Transubstantiation, (for Instance) only from its not being forbidden in the Word of God, and that therefore it must be assented to ; What is this to the Case of Tythes ? Is Transubstantiation now enjoind by the Laws of this Kingdom, as Tythes are ? Or, if it was, would any one be so stupid as to urge that as an Argument for our Compliance with so absurd a Doctrine ? Is the Payment of Tythes contrary to the Common Reason and Senses of Mankind, as Transubstantiation evidently is ? What therefore can be more ridiculous, than to make this a Parallel Case ? Of the same Stamp is his Quotation, from Bishop Stillingfleet, That we ought to believe nothing as an Article of Faith, but what God hath Reveal'd. Doth he think us then so Nonsensical, as to reckon the Payment of Tythes among the Articles of our Faith ? Tho' he charges the Quakers with making the Non-payment of them an Article, yea, a Capital Article of theirs ? Or, what if the Church of England did enjoin some things to be believed and done in the Worship of God, which are not taught in the Gospel ? (which

(which is more than he will be able to prove in his next :) What (I say) is this, to the *Business of Tythes*, which are not required by the Church, to be believed, or done, as an *Act of Worship*? as shall be proved, when we come to the proper Place. Our Author then must know, that we are not talking of *Articles of Faith*, or *Acts of Worship*, but *Matters of Property*; in which the Law of the Land must certainly give as good a Title to the Clergy, as any other Persons. I do therefore make bold to reassume my Argument, That to say, *The Gospel does not enjoin the Payment of Tythes*, is no reason at all: For the Question is not, *Whether the Payment of Tythes be enjoined in the Gospel*; but *whether it be forbidden*? If not, we are bound to obey all *Human Ordinances concerning them*.

What follows, the Reader shall see, was not Overlook'd because it was *too home and powerful*, but because it was *insignificant, and nothing to the purpose*.

We are now come to King *Ethelwolf's* Dedication of Tythes; where my Examiner represents me *very angry*, on purpose to hook in a *Jest*, which he *stole* from T. Elwood, who *stole it* from some-body, that *stole it* from *Erasmus*. But to pass that, and come to what is material: Any one who will cast his Eye upon my *Reflections*, may see, that I do not trouble my self to enquire, whether King *Ethelwolf's* Dedication of Tythes was Superstitious or not; because, take it which way you will, it is of no weight in the Case before us. After I had put down the Matter of Fact as he himself represents it, I argue thus: *And what Inference doth our wise Author draw from hence? Why it must be this, if it be any thing to his purpose, That the Clergy lose all Right to their Tythes, by that erroneous Opinion of King Ethelwolf; and the Quakers may seize upon them, and convert them to their own Use.*

I afterwards make it the Case of a *Lay-man*, to shew the Wildness of this Extravagant Notion; and remove two Objections, by which it may be thought, at first sight, not to be parallel. The Design then of the whole Argument, is plainly to shew, That if you should Allow all he Contends for, yet it doth not answer the End for which it is brought. My Examiner hath had the Goodness, not to make the *least Reply*, but comes off *with a Jest*, and with telling me, King *Ethelwolf's* Superstitious Dedication of Tythes, *is such a Truth* as I would not have the People know. And yet I have no reason to care who knows it, for I must further observe to the Reader, that the whole Mat-
ter

ter is nothing to our present Business; since we are only concern'd about the Laws of the Land *now in force* ; of which, I suppose, my Examiner will not pretend, King *Ethelwolf's* Dedication to be a part, or that *Quakers* have been *Prosecuted upon it* : But when a Man wants an *Argument*, he must try to make a Flourish with a *Popish Superstitious Dedication* —

I added this farther, *ex abundanti*, That *if this Superstition was still in being, it would by no means justify any Private Person, in Detaining what the Law had so manifestly Vested in another Man*. Here, it seems, I am again upon the borders of another *Popish Argument*, p. 17. And pray what is it ? Why, That Things once Dedicated to God, howsoever *Superstitious and Erroneous*, cannot be applied again to *Civil Uses*, without being guilty of *Sacrilege*. And upon this he cries out to the *Impropiators* to look about them ! I must here desire the Reader to consider my Passage just now quoted, and then he will see, that there are no Methods too base, for this Writer to Comply with : I said, If this Superstition was still in being, it would by no means justify any *Private Person* in Detaining what the Law had so manifestly Vested in another Man. But tho' a *Private Person* must Comply with a Law, till it is Repeal'd by a *Lawful Authority* ; yet I hope it doth not follow from thence, that the Legislature can't Repeal it ! So far is it from that, that my asserting, A *Private Person* could not Detain what the Law had Vested in another, tho' the Superstition was still in being, was a plain Implication that he was bound to wait till the Legislature thought fit to apply it to other Uses. But when a Man is past Shame, he will stick at nothing.

As to what he said in reference to the Clergy, That they agreed, on their part, to Say and Sing such a number of Masses and Psalms for the King and his Nobles, I desired to know his Author ; for I told him, his Credit did not run high enough at present, to induce us to take his single Affirmation. He quotes this Passage again, as a *scurrilous Attack* upon him : But it would have been more to his Purpose to have produc'd his Author, if he could, till he doth that, the Passage will go for an *Invention of his own*, and show I had a right Notion of his Credit.

We are now come to that upon which only our present Controversy turns, the Laws of this Kingdom ; by which, my Examiner affirms, Tythes are required to be Paid, as an Act of Divine Worship. This is what he is to prove, as well as affirm ; which (as I shall shew) he is yet very far from doing.

doing. But before I can begin, I must take notice of *an Error which he hath Corrected*; by putting 27th Hen. VIII. Instead of the 32d; the mentioning of which (he says) is *playing at small Game*. But the true Reason why I mentioned it was, because whether it is the 27th or 32d, there is a palpable Mistake. If I had a Mind to have been Nice upon his Faults, I might have blam'd him for not quoting *the Chapter*, as well as *the Year*; by which we might know, what Act he means, there being a *great many Acts* pass'd in the 27th Year of Hen. VIII. But the best way to discover this, will be to quote the Words of his 2d Paper as they stand in Page 11 of my Book, where he wonders *how Impropriators can be easy with such a Title to Tythes, as 32 of Hen. VIII. (let us now make it 27.) gives them; without Application to the Parliament, to make Void that part of the said Statute, which at the same time that it alienates Improprate Tythes, declares them to be due to God and holy Church*. Now if I am able to read *English*, here are two Things affirmed of one and the same Statute. First, that it *alienates Improprate Tythes*. 2dly, That it declares 'em to be *due to God and Holy Church*. If my Examiner therefore pitches upon 27 Hen. VIII. C. 20. that *doth not alienate Improprate Tythes*; if upon 32 Hen. 8. C. 7. that *doth not declare them due to God and Holy Church*. I hope he is not setting up to be *Infallible*, since his late *Illumination*, why can't he then own his Blunder and be Forgiven? Or perhaps he might *fall asleep* while he was reading 27 Hen. VIII. C. 20. and some *unlucky Varlet* or other might change it to 32 C. 7. against *be waked*: Any such Excuse would have serv'd better, than falsely to suggest, he could pay me *twenty such small Errors in my Book*, whereas I Challenge him to pay me *one*.

To his Quotation out of 27 Hen. VIII. that Tythes are *due to God and holy Church*, I answer'd thus, That it was so far from coming up to his Point, of making Tythes an *Act of Worship*; that it did not necessarily infer, they were due of Divine Right in the Judgment of that very Parliament, and I did not imitate my Examiner so far as barely to affirm it; but I gave the following Reasons for that Assertion: That since their Ancestors had by *Human Ordinances* dedicated them to God and the Service of his Church; they might very properly say they were *due to God and Holy Church*. That God is pleased to accept what is given to Pious and Charitable Uses, as a *Gift to himself*. As in *Matt. 25. 40.* it would have look'd better in my Examiner,

aminer, (who pleases himself with the Honour of a Conquest) to have made some Reply to these Arguments, than to come off again with a Jest; as if (says he) a Thing could be due to God and not of Divine Right! here is rare Arguing! han't he spoke like an Oracle? Now do I still maintain, upon the Grounds before mentioned, that a Thing may be due to God, and yet not by Divine Right; for that supposeth a Divine unalterable Precept to found the Obligation upon; and yet it is most certain, a Thing may be due to God, tho' he hath no where requir'd it as such, by an express Command in the Holy Writings. I will put this Writer in Mind of the Instance of *Ananias and Sapphira*, mentioned *Acts* 5th: Who after they had dedicated their whole Estate to God, and the Service of his Church; brought but a certain Part, and laid it at the Apostles Feet, as if it had been all; and were both struck dead upon the Place, for concealing and denying the Rest. The Apostle argues thus with *Ananias*, v. 4. *Whilst it remained* (or before thou hadst dedicated it in so solemn a Manner) *was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own Power? why hast thou conceived this Thing in thine heart?* Here it is plain that the whole Estate of *Ananias* was due to God and his Church; and therefore his Punishment was Just, for concealing and denying some part of the Money: and yet it is as plain, that tho' it was due to God, it was not due to him by divine Right, that is, by any divine Precept, for the Apostle tells him plainly, that before he made that voluntary Oblation of it, it was his own, and perfectly at his own Disposal.

But he desires me to tell him, whether I don't believe King *Henry VIIIth's* Parliament, that declared Tythes to be due to God and Holy Church, did hold the divine Right of Tythes. The Reader will imagine our Controversy grows low now; when it must depend upon my Thoughts of what the Parliament thought, in the time of King *Henry VIII*. But I am resolv'd to oblige my Examiner if I can, tho' his Questions are never so Ridiculous, and therefore tell him, I believe that Parliament did not hold Tythes to be due of Divine Right; and that for this Reason, because they made an Alienation of some of them, which I can't think a Majority of any full and free Parliament could be induc'd to do, that did really think them due of Divine Right.

My Argument about Hospitals is it seems so little to the Purpose, that he fancies I shall be asham'd of it; and yet methinks,

methinks, he should have Confuted it by a better, in order to *make me ashamed*. But we have only this one short Question, *Are their Rents requir'd to be paid as a Divine Right?* No, neither doth my Argument suppose the Clergy's so required: But if *their Tythes* have been dedicated to God, and *their Hospitals* dedicated to God likewise; I hope there is as much Superstition, in the One Dedication, as the Other: I mean there is none in Either; and that was what I brought it to prove, and I find my Examiner could not disprove it, because he was forc'd to relieve himself, with a long Satyr, against the whole Body of the Clergy, and the *Yolk of Priest-Craft*; Topicks that are always to serve at a dead Lift, instead of Arguments. But our Author may go on unregarded by me, and rake together his *whole heap of Scandal*: I who am acquainted with the *Power of his Pen*, have nothing to desire of him in the behalf of my Brethren, but that he would forbear giving them *his good Word*; that being Indeed the *only Weapon he hath now left*, whereby he is capable of *doing any Man a Mischief*.

But I hasten to that upon which our Author chiefly builds his Assertions, that the Payment of Tythes is a *Papist's Yolk, Superstition, and Will Worship*; (terrible Names indeed if there was any Foundation to apply them to the present Case) and that is, That Tythes are requir'd by 27 Hen. VIII. as *due to God and Holy Church*: From whence he makes another very wild Inference of his own, that they are requir'd as an *Act of Divine Worship*; and upon this, declares himself ready *to enter the Lists with any one*, that to pay them is Superstition, without a *Divine Precept*.

In Answer to this I affirm on the other Hand;

1st That Tythes are not *enjoy'd* by 27 Hen. VIII. C. 20. as due to God and Holy Church.

2^{dly}. That if they were *Enacted* there to be so due, that would not conclude them an *Act of Worship*.

3^{dly}. That in Fact, they can neither by Law be demanded, or paid as such.

In order to prove my first Particular, I need only observe; that the 27 Hen. VIII. C. 20. doth consist of two Parts; a *Preamble*, and a *Body*; and that (as they who are acquainted with these Matters know) it is the *Body of the Act only*, which is (properly speaking) *the Law*, or hath any force of Obligation in it; the *Preamble* being a thing purely Introductory. That the *Body of each Law* begins with such Phrases as these: *Our Sovereign Lord the King*
bath

hath Enacted, &c. or Be it Enacted, &c. A necessary Consequence of this is, that Tythes being declared due to God and Holy Church *only in the Preamble* of 27 Hen. VIII. C. 20; such a Declaration is *no Law*, neither hath it any binding Force: from whence I conclude my first Assertion, that Tythes *are not enjoyn'd* by 27th Hen. VIII. C. 20, as *due to God and Holy Church*; and as to what that Parliament *thought of them*, tho' 'tis wholly Impertinent, yet I have given my Opinion already.

2dly, Let it be suppos'd, tho' the Contrary is Evident, that these Words were in the Body of the Act; and that Tythes were enjoyn'd as due to God and Holy Church; yet we could not from hence conclude them enjoyn'd as an Act of Worship. For a Revenue may be set apart for the Service of God and his Church, and yet be both *Claim'd* and *Recover'd*, as all other Debts ordinarily are, without requiring *any Act of Worship* from the Person who pays it, which is in truth the Case of Tythes, notwithstanding what my Examiner would Impose upon us to the Contrary. For that this was the sole Design of the Legislature, will be Evident to any one, who will but look into those Laws, where Acts of Worship are really enjoyn'd. I shall only mention 3 Jac. C. 1. for a *Thanksgiving on the 5th of November*. After the Preamble, the Statute begins thus. *Be it Enacted, &c. That all and singular Ministers, in every Cathedral and Parish Church, or other usual Place for Common Prayer, within this Realm of England, and the Dominions of the same; shall always upon the 5th of November, say Morning Prayer, and give unto Almighty God Thanks for this most happy Deliverance; and that all and every Person and Persons, inhabiting within this Realm of England, and the Dominions of the same, shall always upon that Day, diligently and faithfully resort to the Parish Church, or Chappel accustomed, or to some usual Church or Chappel, where the said Morning Prayer, Preaching, or other Service of God, shall be used; and then and there to abide Orderly and Soberly during the time of the said Prayers, Preaching, or other Service of God, there to be used and ministred.* Here then we have an *Act of Worship* plainly required by Law; all Ministers are to say Morning Prayer, &c. and all Persons are to resort to the Parish Church, &c. always upon the 5th of November. Let my Examiner produce such a Law as this, for his Act of Worship, till that be done, I hope he will excuse us, if we will not believe the Airy Inventions of his unsettled Brain, in Contradiction to our own Senses.

For 3^{dly}, Let it be farther considered, that Tythes can neither by Law be demanded or paid as an Act of Worship. The Reason of this is evident, because all the necessary Circumstances of Worship are wanting, which every Act must have in Order to its being perform'd at all : Such as *Time, Place, Order, &c.* For if I was ask'd to prove, the Service appointed in the Book of Common Prayer requir'd by Law, as an *Act of Worship* : The Method to do it is to give a Satisfactory Answer to these Questions. 1 By *what Law* is this Act of Worship required ? By the *two Acts for Uniformity*. At *what time* is it to be perform'd ? *Upon every Lords Day, and the other times appointed in the said Book*. In *what Method* is this Act of Worship required ? According to the Order printed in the said Book of Common Prayer. In *what Places* is it to be offer'd up ? In all the *Cathedral, Collegiate and Parish Churches and Chappels within the Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and Town of Berwick upon Tweed*. By *what Persons* ? By the *Ministers and People jointly and severally*. I desire this Author to try his Hand, when he writes next, and see how *his Act of Worship* will suit with these plain Questions. And I must tell him, it is not his *Confident turn of nothing in the World can be plainer, and the more I look into it the better I see it* ; that must Convince his Reader, but an honest downright Argument, it he hath such a one, which will weigh down a Thousand such Phrases as those, with all Judicious Persons. If my Examiner could produce a Law in Force that would come up to these ; and a *Form* (suppose such a One as Mr. *Lestly's*, at which he discharges such a Torrent of Wit) *enjoy'd by Authority* ; and *some of the Tythes* brought for an Offering at a certain time, *in lieu of the Whole*. This would be to his Purpose ; but according to his present Supposition, we have *Worship and no Worship* : Worship without the *Circumstances* naturally necessary to it ; without *Time, or Place, or Order, or Persons* : A Worship wholly Chimerical, and (as the Law stands) *impracticable* : Such an Act of Worship as in Fact can neither by the Law be demanded or paid, which was what I undertook to prove.

I doubt not but the Reader will think I have been tedious, where a few Words would have been sufficient ; but as this Objection of Tythes being required as an Act of Worship, is all that he can colourably say to Defend himself : I was willing to spend some Pains in shewing its *Weakness and Absurdity*. I could enlarge farther if I thought

it needfull, but at present I shall only offer these two Heads to his Consideration.

1st. How he can reconcile the Laws requiring Tythes to be paid as an Act of Divine Worship, with their requiring them to be paid to *Laymen*, who are Impropriators?

2^{dly}. How he can reconcile this with the Act of Toleration, which tho' it exempts all Dissenters from the Penalties for *not frequenting our Worship*; yet doth not exempt them from *the Payment of Tythes*? And the Reason is Obvious, because Tythes are not enjoy'd by our Church to be believ'd or done as a Part of the Worship or Service of God: But are requir'd by Law to be paid, as all other Common Debts; so that herein also appears a plain Act of Injustice, in Substracting Tythes; in that it is a violent Seizure upon our Neighbour's Property: Upon that which neither they, nor their Ancestors, ever *Bought*, or *paid for*: Nay upon that, which if they *had bought* they must have given *so many Years Purchase* more for the Estate. So that upon the Whole, any Quaker may as Justifiably seize upon *the Product of the Ground next to his own*, as upon any Tythes, the one being just as much his Property as the other.

It is now a proper time to let my Examiner know, that what followed his 3^d Reason, was overlook'd, because it was *Insignificant*; for it depends wholly upon taking that for granted, which he hath by no means prov'd; (the Contrary to which I believe the Reader will now think is prov'd) and that is, that Tythes are requir'd by Law as an *Act of Worship*. When he hath clear'd this Point, it will be time enough to argue whether a *Divine Precept* is necessary, for every thing appointed in the Service, or Worship of God. A Question which I find he understands no more than the former; and in which, when it is truly stated; (If I had a Mind to wander) I could easily shew him to be mistaken: But I perceive he is quite *Sick of his Controversie*, and would fain raise a *Dust*, on purpose to *slip away* in the midst of it: Whereas I am resolv'd, to keep him close to his Business; and do therefore Insist, that he should first prove Tythes requir'd by Law as an Act of Worship; before we proceed to his other Argument, which is nothing but an Assertion built purely upon that Supposition.

Let us now briefly Sum up what hath been said upon this Subject.

To begin then with what my Examiner hath offer'd, which is nothing to the Purpose.

Under which Head are to be placed, all his Arguments drawn from the *Divine Right of Tythes*: A Point which I have designedly wav'd, as looking upon the Title sufficiently secured by the *Laws of this Kingdom*.

His Quotations out of Mr. *Lesly* are likewise (as I have observ'd) wholly Forreign; who proceeds upon the Foundation of a *Divine Right*.

Hither also we must bring all his Jests, and pretended Arguments from *King Ethelwolf's Dedication*. For altho, if it was a Law now in force, it would not answer his End: Since a *Popish Legislature*, may certainly (notwithstanding their Superstitious Tenets) make as firm Grants as a *Protestant One*; otherwise what would become of all the Statutes made *before the Reformation*? Yet as I am willing to keep him from flying from the thing in Debate, if I can; the plain and short Answer that I return is this, That it is now no Part of our Law, and consequently no Part of our *Dispute*. All he hath said about the *Popes Supremacy, Transubstantiation, &c.* and *Articles of Faith*, is as distant from his Subject as *East and West*. The Papists insisting chiefly upon the former, because, (they say) they are *Commanded* in Scripture; and besides (as I have shewn) they are by no means Applicable to our present Subject.

These Things being remov'd, let us now see wherein we agree, and where we differ, as to what directly concerns this Case of Tythes.

We are agreed (I think) as to the Sence of the Writers of the New Testament, (*viz.*) That a Maintenance is plainly Commanded for those who Preach the Gospel.

We are agreed likewise (I suppose) that the Law hath actually determined, what this Maintenance shall be.

The only Reason then which hath the least Shadow of an Argument, that is offer'd by my Examiner, why he cannot submit himself to these Ordinances of Man is, because Tythes are requir'd as an Act of Worship, and therefore not being enjoin'd in the Gospel, he cannot pay them without a Divine Precept.

This is what I have (as I hope) Examined to the bottom. I have shewn,

1st. That Tythes are not enjoin'd as due to God and Holy Church, by 27 *Hon.* VIII. C. 20.

2^{ndly}. That if they were *so Enacted*, it would not conclude them an *Act of Worship*.

3^{dly}. That in Fact they can neither by Law be demanded or paid as such.

Here therefore I expect my Examiner should level his Artillery when he writes next; and not take Sanctuary in Excursions nothing to his Purpose. As this is the only thing offer'd which hath so much as the Face of an Objection, why he cannot comply with the Laws of the Kingdom in this Instance; so I do not only expect, that he should answer *my Reasons* against it; but likewise offer some better of *his own* in its behalf. And I must tell him plainly, that if he doth not do this, he leaves a poor, precarious Assertion, as *Naked and Defenceless*, as *he himself came from the Womb of his Mother*.

Of Water-Baptism, and the Supper with Bread and Wine.

The first Thing that my Examiner takes notice of, which is at all Material, is the Three Fallacies I had charg'd upon him, in his Method of handling this Subject, which were,

1st. A Supposition that our Two Sacraments are yet only Parts of the *Jewish Law*, notwithstanding our blessed Lord hath so evidently made them *standing Parts of the Christian Religion*. This (he says) is a *Mistake*, and *what I shall never be able to prove*. But I need only appeal to all who can read the Bible, whether I have proved it or not: For I defie any Man to shew me a more positive command, than that of our Saviour to his Apostles, when he says, *Go and teach all Nations Baptizing them: And do this in Remembrance of me*.

2^{dly}. An Application of all those Texts of Scripture, which have a Reference to those *Jewish Rites*, which are Confessedly Abolished; to the Two Christian Sacraments, which are as manifestly always to be retained: His first Objection is against the Word Sacrament; which he observes, was *borrow'd from the Heathen*; and which he calls in the same Page, a *Heathenish Word*. Now the using a Term in Matters of Religion, (to which Sence I will suppose our Author would here restrain it) which hath been before made use of by Heathens, is so far from being Criminal, that we have *numerous Authorities* for it in the Writings of the New Testament. To Instance in some only: The Words *Temple, Altar, Priest, Sacrifice*, are all there; and yet it is undeniable, that these Words were in Use *among the Heathens*. The very Term Δύσ, or the ~~Word~~,
was

was not only among the *Jews*, but the *Platonists* also. Nay *St. Paul* tells us, *Acts* 17. 23. that when he was at *Athens*, the Superstitious Heathens had an Altar there, with this Inscription ; *To the Unknown God*. What then must we do ? must we blot all these Words, and many more, out of our Bibles, and cast off even the Names of the *World* and of *God*, because the Heathens had the same Terms ? If not, I hope here is Warrant sufficient to Justifie our doing the like ; provided the Term be used in a Sound Sense. And indeed tho' I know we are Commanded in Respect to the Heathen, *not to learn their Works* ; Yet I perswade my self it is a Sin of this Author's own making, or at least of Authors of his Size ; *not to learn their Words*. But thus it happens when *small Readers* are so Conceited, as to become *small Writers*, and venture to put down Arguments, tho' they are not capable of discerning whither they lead, or the Consequences that attend them.

But he goes on, *Page* 22, and says of me, that I having own'd *Page* 38. 41. that Water-Baptism and the Supper with Bread and Wine were *Jewish Rites* ; he presumes 'tis past my Skill to alter their Property, and make them *Christian*. I'm afraid this Writer hath got such an ill Habit, that it's now very difficult for him to represent a Thing fairly. What I own in the Pages refer'd to is this, That *Baptism, or Purification with Water, was one of the Initiating Ordinances for the Jewish Proselytes ; and that the Custom of Eating Bread, and Drinking Wine, was used when the Passover was Celebrated*. But I am very far from owning, that the Water-Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord with Bread and Wine, *now in use among us*, were ever *Jewish Rites* : I mean, were ever us'd by them to the same End and Purpose that we use them now. (For tho' Purification with Water was a Mark of Initiation to their Proselytes, yet it did not make them Christians ; nor was it done, *in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* ; and altho' they did eat Bread and drink Wine at the end of the Passover ; they never did it *in Remembrance of the Death of Christ*.) So far is it then from that, that I affirm them to be *Christian Ordinances*, Positively Commanded by Christ himself, and therefore there is no need of altering their Property.

His 3^d Fallacy lay, in wresting those Places of Scripture, which give a Preference to the *Inward Part of the Sacrament* ; (and which we all acknowledge ought to be preferred)

fer'd) as if they were so many Proofs, that *the Outward* are to be neglected. In his Answer he doth not pretend to deny the Charge, but thinks to come off by asking a Question or two, nothing to the present Purpose. *Why is not that Duty put in Practice? Why are not the People taught this Doctrine by their Pastors?* Why so they are, and they are taught likewise; that the Use of the *Outward Sign*, is the Way appointed by Christ, to receive the *Inward Part*, or thing signified; and they are charged, not to be so lifted up with *Spiritual Pride*, as, (instead of waiting upon God in the Method he hath appointed) to *kick at his Precepts*, and think themselves *Wiser than Infinite Wisdom*.

As to the several Difficulties he puts down *Pag. 23*, which he met with before in Relation to his Compliance with these Institutions; he tells me, I have given them no Solution: And he may think what he will, the Reason was not because I *could not*, but because I found he was willing to *steal away from his proper Business*, which I did not intend he should: For pray to what Purpose is it to endeavour to Convince a Man, *who hath the Power of Administering? who are the proper Subjects?* and *how the Sacrament is to be receiv'd?* when he doth not own there are any such things as *Sacraments* appointed? Is not this plainly *beginning at the wrong End?* Let him therefore first own the *Outward Part* of the Sacraments, of *Divine Institution*; and then I will promise my Endeavours, to remove any Difficulties that may arise, as to the Manner of receiving them. But till he doth that, he is mistaken in me, if he thinks I am to be decoy'd or diverted after such a Manner: And as to his Challenge, I tell him, I am of the same Opinion, in the several Particulars, with the *Church of England as by Law Established*; whose Tenets in these Points are so fully known in her *Canons, Articles, Rubrick, and Homilies*; that this may serve as a *full and Categorical Answer to all his Questions*. And when he thinks fit to give up the Thing now in Dispute, about the Sacraments themselves; if then his *doubting Soul* remains unsatisfied; I offer him to pick and choose out of all his Difficulties, and if he takes that side of the Question, which is contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, I promise him he *shall not want an Answer*.

As to the Dirt he endeavours (tho' in vain) to throw at the Clergy; as if *many* of them were of *loose Lives*, and *some believ'd nothing of Religion*: Tho' I dare say, if he was call'd upon to *name his many*, it would appear he hath

printed a *Scandalous Slander*; yet I shall let it pass amongst the other Instances of his *Christian Temper and Moderation*. The Reader may imagine, I could easily recriminate, was I dispos'd to tread in the *base and dishonourable Steps of my Examiner*; at present therefore I shall only desire him to apply his *own Reflection to himself*, to consider the *Infamous Part* he hath lately acted, and what the World can think of him, and his *Religion*.

But he fancies, he hath brought me to an insuperable Difficulty: For if these Sacraments are not *absolutely necessary* to Salvation, how can I prove them *generally so*, he desires to see in my next. And yet all this Idle boasting was perfectly needless, for if he hath recovered his Eyesight, he might have seen it prov'd in my last, *Pag. 35.* to which I refer. But there are none so blind, as they who will not see; and I presume the true Reason why he did not, was, because it contain'd, what he could sooner object to, than Answer. For to say of the Sacrament of Baptism, (for Instance) that it is *absolutely necessary to Salvation*, is liable to such a Construction, as if we affirm'd, *no Man could be sav'd, who is not Baptiz'd*: This is what we do not affirm, we leave such to the *Mercy of God*. But yet we say it is *generally necessary*; necessary where it can be had; necessary according to the *Terms of the Gospel*; necessary to our being in *Covenant with Christ*. And tho' I would not to gain the whole World, die unbaptiz'd; yet far be it from me to determine, that our good God hath no Compassion in store, for any of those, who have missed that Water-Baptism which he hath so plainly Commanded. And thus much we may safely say, that *Eternal Happiness is a Pearl of too great a Price*, to be left to a Hazard, when we may be certain to possess it, if the Fault be not our own.

He afterwards observes, that he added the *abstaining from things strangled, and from Blood*, enjoyn'd *Acts 15. 29.* and the *Anointing the Sick with Oil in the Name of the Lord*, mentioned *James 5. 14.* as Arguments, that Water Baptism and the Supper may like wise be disused; with which I was so pinch'd, that I pretend not to understand them. Whereas the true Motive of my passing them over was, because I did in Truth understand, they were nothing to his Purpose. The Occasion of enjoying the first of these, is clearly set down, in the Beginning of *Acts 15.* where we find that after Paul and Barnabas had gathered a Church at Antioch, certain Men which came down from Judea, taught the

the Brethren, and said ; *except ye be circumcised after the Manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved, v. 1.* Upon this there arose so great a Dissention among them, that Paul and Barnabas were sent to the Apostles, and Elders, at Jerusalem, for a final Determination of this Controversy. Who having declared the whole Matter to them, received this preremptory Sentence. *v. 28, 29. It seemed good to the holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater Burthen, than these necessary Things : That ye abstain from Meats offer'd to Idols, and from Blood, and from Things strangled, and from Fornication.* From hence it is plain to any one, who considers the Occasion of this Decree, that the Commanding them, to abstain from *things Strangled, and from Blood* ; was purely for the Peace and quiet of the Church, for the sake of which, they were at that time necessary ; and altho' they thought it unreasonable, to compel them *to be Circumcised* : Which was what they from Judea insisted upon ; nevertheless they judg'd it expedient, that they should Sacrifice their Christian Liberty in these Instances, to the Weakness and Mis-apprehensions of the Jews. That these were their Intentions, and that they were so understood, is plain by the Event : Since when time, and a riper Understanding, had wore off these Prejudices from the Jewish Christians ; the Injunction ceas'd, and was no longer observed ; the Occasion for which it was given, being now at an End. If my Examiner shall pretend to argue from hence, that the Sacraments may also be refused, because they were enjoyn'd in Compliance with the Jews ; I must desire him to *prove* as well as *affirm* it. Let him shew out of the Sacred Writings, that there was ever any Controversy between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, in Relation to the Efficacy and Obligation of these holy Ordinances ; and what Determination the Apostles gave upon it. Let him shew there was ever the least Scruple, in Respect to their Submission to these divine Institutions ; or the least Intimation in Scripture, they were administred to comply with any thing but the *Commands of Christ* : If he cannot do this, tho' he affirm as long, and as positively as he pleases, yet the Reader will see this vast Difference between his Case and mine ; that one hath nothing to support it, but is perfectly *gratis Dictum* ; whilst the other depends upon the plain Scope and Declarations of the holy Writings.

The Anointing the Sick with Oil in the Name of the Lord, is a plain Allusion to a Ceremony in use among the Apostles,

postles, when they *healed Diseases* and work'd *Miraculous Cures*. Thus it is said *Mark 6. 13.* That *they cast out many Devils, and Anointed many with Oil that were Sick, and healed them*; not that the Apostles always thought themselves tyed to the Use of this Ceremony, for they effected their Cures often without it; so in the *Acts* by *taking by the Hand, by Embracing, by a bare Word. C. 3. v. 7. C. 20. v. 10. C. 9. v. 34, 40.* Now in Reference to this Usage, *St. James* likewise says *C. 5. 14, 15. is any Sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with Oil in the Name of the Lord, and the Prayer of Faith shall save the Sick, and the Lord shall raise him up.* So that you see clearly from these Scriptures, that this was a Ceremony *Sometimes used, sometimes disused* by the Apostles in their miraculous Cures of the Sick and Diseased: *St. James* here alludes to it as such, and as such it might be innocently either omitted, or retained. But when this came in after Ages to be abused to unlawful Purposes; when the Papists came to insist upon it as a *Sacrament*, tho' it is evidently no more than a *bare Ceremony*, and was unquestionably look'd upon as such in the Apostolick Age: Nay when it was never so much as *Instituted by Christ*, or any where declared necessary, or a Means of Grace: It was thought needful, to put a stop to this Practice, which might undoubtedly be done with very good Warrant; since the Apostles themselves visited many sick Persons, and healed them, without giving them *any Unction at all*: Which plainly shews, that it was not necessary, but intended only as a Ceremonial Action; which might be either complied with, or forborn, as was most Expedient. Perhaps my Examiner may reply to this, that he esteems Water Baptism, and the Supper, to be just such Ceremonies as this. But I must again remind him, that there's a mighty Difference betwixt *saying* and *proving*; if he thinks fit to attempt the Latter, let him shew this Unction to be an *Institution of Christ*, or that he hath said of it, *do this in Remembrance of me*: Let him shew me out of the Bible, that except a Man be Anointed with Oil, *he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*: That *he that believeth, and is Anointed with Oil shall be saved*: That this outward Unction is the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, and a shewing forth his Death*: That *we have Remission of Sins and the Gift of the Holy Ghost by being Anointed with Oil*: I say, let him produce such Texts as these, for Anointing the Sick with Oil, (which are all to

be shewn for Baptism and the Lords Supper) and we will hearken to him ; and yet if he could produce such, what would the Consequence be ? That we ought to discard our two Sacraments ? No, quite the contrary. The Result of all would be only this ; that we ought to be anointed with Oil in the Name of the Lord.

My Quarrel with him for slipping in the Word *Sacramental* among those of St. Paul, was not, (as he would perswade the Reader) for adding a Word to the Text in a Parenthesis. That I knew to be usual ; but for adding such a Word, as quite perverted the Meaning of the Apostle ; who was far from intending, that those Words which are particularly applied to the several Judaical Observances there mentioned, should be applied to the Sacraments of the Christian Religion. And therefore he did not act like an honest Commentator by such an Application. If any one doubt of this, let him but read over what St. Paul says, 1. Cor. 11. of receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and then see how it can be made Consistent, with its being a thing Indifferent, or that we should not judge one another in this respect. And besides I must now talk farther with him on this Account. For if *Sacramental* is a Heathenish Word, and he doth in good Earnest believe there is any Evil in using it : It was certainly but Heathenishly done of him, to slip it into the Sacred Text of St. Paul. But it seems in my owning these Jewish Observances abolish'd by the Coming of Christ, I have given away my Cause ; given it away unanswerably. A Person who had had no Dealings with this Writer, would be apt to throw away his Pen, and give up his Cause indeed for lost, to see him Triumph with such Assurance.

But I who am us'd to him, begin now to know his meaning, when an Argument is so weak that he himself can't but distrust its Strength ; he supports it with a nothing can be plainer, the more I look into it, the better I see it ; This I think is unanswerable. Reckoning it sufficient, if the Deficiencies of his Brain are supplied by his Forehead. But you must know this is not one, but a Cluster of Arguments hanging together.

First he proves, that since the Jews had this Rite, it must be, (or at least have been) a Judaical Observance. Now this is so plain, that it is ready to burst with self Evidence.

His Second Argument proceeds upon the Supposition, that the several Judaical Observances mention'd, Col. 2. 16. are

are abolished. But what if I should put in a *Caveat* here, and affirm, that the Bread and Wine which the *Jews* eat and drank after the Passover, is *not included in this Text*. Why then he can prove it thus. *Bread and Wine is Meat and Drink*. (That's beyond Dispute) and Meat and Drink being mention'd as a Religious Observance, *Col. 2. 16*, and abolish'd by the Coming of Christ. Therefore,

All Meat and Drink (as a Religious Observance) is abolish'd by the Coming of Christ.

Pretty Dove ! how unanswerably he Argues ! We have here no less than two palpable Mistakes in this Irrefragable Argument.

For *First*, The Apostle doth not refer in this Place to the Bread and Wine which the *Jews* used after the Passover, but to *those Meats and Drinks particularly*, which were forbidden by their Law : Those of which they said, *touch not, taste not, handle not*. Which he left Christians at Liberty to eat and drink, or to forbear, with this Injunction only ; that they should not judge or condemn one another. But,

Secondly, If we should allow St. Paul to intend *this very Bread and Wine* among the *Jewish* Meats and Drinks here spoken of, yet I hope that would not hinder us, but we might use Meat and Drink in our *Christian Ordinances*, especially if Christ thought fit to enjoin them. The Fallacy then is what the Logicians call, *a dicto Secundum quid ad dictum Simpliciter*. That is, drawing a General Conclusion, from particular Premises. I told my Examiner in my Reflections, that this was what we insisted upon, to wit, a plain Command out of the New Testament for our Christian Sacraments, and we are so far from laying any stress, upon the eating and drinking Bread and Wine, in Use among the *Jews* ; that we do not found any part of our Obligation to the Sacraments upon their Usages, but because they are clearly enjoin'd by our Lord and Saviour ; I told him also, that his retreating to *Types and Shadows* was but a wrapping himself up in Darknes in hopes to be cover'd : But he is resolv'd still to Blunder on in the same Track, tell him what I will, that he may Convince me his Scull or his Conscience is Impenetrable.

To prove that Water Baptism is Commanded, *Mat. 28. 19*. I argued thus : *If to Baptize and to Wash, are Words originally of the same Import, and Washing implies Water; then tho' the word Water, is not there, the Thing is plainly Commanded*. To this he answers, That if by Water; I mean

mean material or Elementary-Water ; he agrees that to Baptize and to Wash are Words originally of the same Import ; but Washing or Baptizing doth not always imply Water ; and the Word Water being not mention'd, the thing is not plainly Commanded. This (it seems) is fair Arguing, and foils my chief Argument. If I should demand a Scripture Instance, wherein Washing or Baptizing does not imply Water, he refers me to Matt. 3. 11. He shall Baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire. And Acts 1. 5. Ye shall be Baptized with the Holy Ghost or Spiritual Baptizm.

I was willing to put down his fair Argument at large, that the Reader might see it at one View ; and it amounts just to thus much : That because to Baptize is not always taken in its genuine and litteral Sense in the Scriptures ; (for when it is so taken it does always imply Water.) Therefore it must not be so taken Matt. 28. 19. Or because we clearly see, by the Words that go along with it, and the Sense of the Text, that to Baptize hath sometimes a figurative Meaning : Therefore it must have such a Meaning, Matt 28. 19; tho' neither the Words which go along with it, or the Sense of the Text do require a figurative Interpretation, but quite the Contrary. If my Reader will forgive me, I desire to borrow this fair Argument a little while, in order to shew it in its true Colours. We read, Acts 12. that after St. Peter was delivered out of Prison by an Angel, he came to the House of Mary the Mother of John, and v. 13. as Peter knocked at the Door a Damsel came to hearken. Now if any one hath a Mind to enter into a learned Controversy with me, whether this was truly a Door or no, at which Peter knocked ; I'll undertake to prove it was not, by my Examiner's fair Argument in its full Strength. And it proceeds thus,

If by a Door you mean a material Door, I answer thus : I agree that the original Word *θύρα* signifies a Door ; but it doth not always signifie a material Door, and the the Word Material not being mentioned, it is not plain that St. Peter knock'd at a material Door. This is fair Arguing, and foils your chief Argument.

If you should demand a Scripture Instance wherein *θύρα* doth not signifie a material Door, I shall give you three out of many. Our Lord saith of himself Jo. 10. 9. I am the Door ; and it is said Acts 14. 27. that God hath opened the Door of Faith unto the Gentiles. Nay we have the very Words which you would perswade me are to be literally

taken in St: Peter's Case, Rev. 3. 20. Behold I stand at the Door and knock.

Let any indifferent Man give his Opinion, whether if I should really urge such an Argument as this : I was not better qualified for *Bedlam* than to write Books. My Argument then stands unshaken, that if to Baptize and to Wash are Originally Words of the same Import, Water-Baptism is Commanded, *Matt. 28. 19* because no one can be washed without some Liquor, and the Liquor the Apostles used was Water. And I do still tell him, that to shift this off with a figurative Sense, is wretchedly Ridiculous, unless it be first shewn, that the Words cannot be taken in their plain literal Meaning. This was what he could not shew, and therefore *very honestly* left this Passage out of his Quotation : tho' it contains a plain easy Rule, to know whether Words are to be taken in their native Sense or no. I desir'd him, *pag. 38.* to oblige me with a certain Rule when we must take Baptize in a literal, and when in a figurative Sense : Nay, I gave him a Rule of my own, that it must be always taken literally, where it is not restrain'd by the Words accompanying it. But what do I talk of Rules, which are a sort of wicked *human Inventions*, that do almost as much Mischief in Disputes, as Logick ? Vile Contrivances made to put an End to Controversies, and which ought above all things to be avoided by him, who is on the *wrong side of the Question*. In short, the present Debate between me and my Examiner, turns upon this single Point; whether the word Baptize, *Matt. 28. 19.* is to be *literally* or *figuratively* understood. The literal Acceptation, is what I insist upon, and then it manifestly signifies to Baptize with Water. To this he replies, that it is taken figuratively in other Places, and therefore *ought to be so here*. The plain Answer to that is, that where-ever it is figuratively taken, the Words which accompany it, do necessarily restrain it to such a Sense. As in his own Instance to Baptize with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire; doth so plainly limit the Meaning of the Word Baptize, that no one of common Sense can help seeing, that to Baptize with the *Holy Ghost* and *with Fire*, cannot signify to *Baptize with Water*. But then to apply this *Indiscriminately* (as my Examiner doth) to the word Baptize, when it is not to be restrained by the Words which accompany it, is, I must again tell him, (let him hate the Saying if he will) *wretchedly Ridiculous*. For if we are not to understand the plain Words of Scripture in their literal Sense (unless

evident

evident Necessity obliges us to the contrary ; and this Necessity is not to be measured by *positive Assertions*, but the *Word of God*) we must even lay aside our Bibles, for there can be no End of Contention and Wrangling. I must remind him as to what he adds, (that to Baptize ought to be so understood here, or else we should *Exclude the true Gospel-Baptism*) that *Confident Assertions* weigh nothing with me ; and that I hope in this Treatise fully to satisfy every honest Reader out of the Scriptures ; that true Gospel Baptism is no otherwise to be had than by *Baptizing with Water*.

This likewise serves for a full Answer to his next Paragraph ; for if to Baptize, is to be taken literally in the words of the Commission ; and when it is so taken *always implies Water* : Then it is evident, that *Christian Baptism* must be administred with Water as well as *John's* ; and that these Texts, *He shall Baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire* ; which contain only a particular Promise to the Apostles, which was visibly perform'd on the Day of Pentecost, cannot be generally applied, to the Exclusion of Water-Baptism, which is so plainly commanded, and was so manifestly used by the Apostles themselves. This I had shewn in my Reflections pag. 39. to be so clear from several Texts of Scripture, that it is he only who denies it, that makes himself *wiser than the Holy Penman*, and is guilty of a bold Presumption.

As to the particular Case of the Apostles, (St. Paul excepted) I told him, the Scripture was wholly silent, whether they were Baptized with Water or no ; and that therefore he could no more prove the *Negative*, than I could the *Affirmative*. Upon this he Swells and Triumphs without Measure, tho' it makes not in the least for his Purpose. He don't dare to say, (cries he) that the Apostles were Baptized with Water, in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost ; well knowing he was not able to prove it. And what if I should retort the same to him ? He doth not dare to say, the Apostles were not so Baptized, well knowing he is not able to prove it. Here we might *Heckor*, and *Challenge*, and *Dare* one another, and at last leave the Argument, just where we found it. I therefore proceeded to shew, pag. 36. That the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, which they Received, was so plainly visible and Miraculous ; that it cannot be drawn into Practice, if Ordinary Rules were superseded : *Acts 2. 1. &c.* And I told him likewise, that as the Quakers could not pretend to give

such Proofs of their Spiritual Baptism, they ought to lay hold on those outward and ordinary Means of Grace, which Christ hath Commanded, and all Christian Churches have Executed to this Day. My Examiner hath a much better Talent at *Shifting* an Argument, than *Answering* it; and therefore would put me off with this for a Reply. *Does he believe that none are Baptized with the Baptism of the Spirit, but those who have such Miracles? If so, what is become of the Inward and Spiritual Grace of Baptism in this Age, which (he cries) is preferable to the outward Sign, and to be the principle (he would say principal) Part of Baptism?* Any Man that reads this would imagine, that I had made a Doubt, whether we could have the Baptism of the Spirit in this Age, now Miracles are ceased, whereas the Thing that my Examiner was to have Replied to, if he could, was this, That if we should suppose, tho' not grant, that the Apostles were not Baptized with Water: Whether that particular Instance, which was an Accomplishment of a particular Promise, and was attended with such Miraculous Circumstances, to shew the Divine Approbation; whether this, I say, can excuse us, to whom all these Circumstances are wanting, from complying with a plain General Command of our Saviour, back'd as plainly with Apostolical Practice, and that follow'd with the concurrent Usage of all Christian Churches? As to his *Shifting Questions* I answer thus: That the Baptism of the Spirit is to be had without Miracles; and the same way too in *this Age*, that the Apostles themselves made use of in *that Age*; my Meaning is, by Baptizing with Water.----

What he urges afterwards, of the *Inward Operation of the Holy Ghost in the Heart being sufficient*, without using the outward appointed Means; is fit for them to believe, who will rely upon his bare Assertion, in Contradiction to the Holy Scripture; and besides what follows, is a plain Confutation of it. For I observ'd *pag. 36.* that St. Paul (one of the Apostles) was unquestionably baptized; *Acts 22. 16.* and yet his Conversion and Appointment to his Office was very Miraculous: If the extraordinary Effusion of the Spirit, which was frequent in those Days, was of it self sufficient to Baptize or Wash him: without Doubt, he had received it in a very sensible Manner: But we see plainly, he was afterward enjoyn'd the outward instituted Means of Water-Baptism; to shew us, that God will not dispense with the Omission of stated Ordinances. I did expect that after I had so fully shewn him his Mistake,

in

in pretending to make the Case of the other Apostles a Precedent for succeeding Christians, whereby they might disuse Water-Baptism; he would have been so Civil in his turn, as to have replied something to this Case of *St. Paul*. But it is an ugly crabbed Argument, that lies within the small Compass of five Lines; and therefore he thought it more Convenient wholly to overlook it, and trust himself and his Cause to the Mercy of the Reader.

Any one that will give credit to him, would think by his next Paragraph, that I have bestowed upon him hard Words for not quoting the Apostle *Peter Sincerely*, or as he afterwards expresses it *Verbatim*. Whereas my Charge against him was this; that he did not quote him out of *Acts 10.* where the Matter is recorded at Large; but mangles the Account, for fear his Reader should observe, that he baptized those *Gentiles* with Water, even after the *Holy Ghost was fallen upon them*; and that this was the true Specimen of his Sincerity, see my Reflections, pag. 37.

But I hasten to his Explication of the Text, which (if you'll believe him) was omitted before for *Brevity's sake*; and which (I dare say) the Reader will be of Opinion had much better been omitted now.

He observes from *v. 44.* That because the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word, the Apostle *Peter* was made a *Minister of the Baptism of the Spirit*. Now if he means that they had extraordinary Gifts conferred on them, while *Peter* was speaking, that is beyond Dispute: But that this was not the Christian Baptism is as plain, because they receiv'd Water-Baptism afterwards. And indeed we find these miraculous Effusions, which were at that time necessary for the sudden Propagation of the Gospel; sometimes (as here) Conferred before, sometimes after Water-Baptism; and plainly distinguished from it. To shew us, that the *Outward Ordinance* was to be the constant and standing Method of Gods Ordinary Grace, even at and after the ceasing of these miraculous Gifts.

In the Case of the *Ephesians, Acts 19.* Water-Baptism preceded these extraordinary Manifestations. *v. 5.* They were Baptized in the Name of the Lord *Jesus*. After which, *v. 6.* Paul laid his Hands upon them, and the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with Tongues and Prophefied. So that here likewise is a plain Distinction between their Water-Baptism, and the wonderful Effusions of the Spirit which they afterwards received. But to return to the In-

stance of St. Peter. The short and material Question arising from hence is this: Whether this extraordinary Effusion was of it self sufficient to make them Members of Christ without Water-Baptism? And it plainly appears it was not; for the Apostle said, *v. 47. Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be Baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* And I must tell my Examiner, that this Text is so very plain and pressing upon them; that if there was no other, whereby to determine the meaning of our Saviour's Commission, or indeed, if the Words of the Commission did not determine their own Meaning: This must put an end to the Controversy with all truly Conscientious Enquirers.

But he proceeds and tells us, that *perhaps he shall startle his Reader, when he says this Place is in favour of Quakerism.* I agree with him entirely; tho' I suppose all that the Reader can be startled at is, to see a Writer posses'd with such an *unmeasurable Degree of Confidence*, as to make us believe that St. Peter's *Baptizing with Water*, is an Argument against *Water-Baptism*.

As we are upon a serious Subject, I desire the Reader to *hold his sides*, and forbear laughing if he can, whilst I consider his first Reason which now follows, (*viz.*)

That had Peter understood *Water-Baptism to be Commanded*, *Matt. 28. 19.* he would not have asked whether any Man could forbid it; but proceeded forthwith to the Executing thereof; but his asking leave of the Jewish Converts shews, that he did it in Compliance with a Jewish Rite, and not a Christian Precept.

Now in Answer to this most ridiculous Position I do affirm, that St. Peter's Words, *can any Man forbid Water, &c.* Are so far from implying an asking leave of the Jewish Converts, or any one else; that they do neither more nor less than *vehemently assert*, that no Man can forbid Water. To give some Instances out of many, *Can the Ethiopian change his Skin?* *Jer. 13. 23.* *Can a Man be profitable to God?* *Job 22. 1.* *Can a Devil open the Eyes of the Blind?* *John 10. 21.* That is, the *Ethiopian cannot change his Skin.* A Man cannot be profitable to God. A Devil cannot open the Eyes of the Blind. So likewise, *can any Man forbid Water?* is the same as *no Man can forbid Water.* And yet see and admire, with what Assurance it is usher'd in, as if it was to startle the Reader by being in favour of Quakerism. I will oblige him with one Instance more, *Luke 6. 39. can the Blind lead the Blind?* Which I do not only produce to shew it

it a positive Assertion that the Blind cannot lead the Blind without Danger that *they will both fall into the Ditch*: But likewise to shew the poor deluded Quakers of my Parish, what a miserable Condition they are in, to have such a blind and blundering Explainer of the Scriptures for their Guide: St. Peter therefore proceeds to the Execution of his Office, without asking any leave; as knowing Water-Baptism Commanded 28. 19.

His next Objection is taken from the following Words; *and he commanded them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord*. From whence he infers, that they were not Baptized in the Name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost, in pursuance of the Commission Matt. 28. 19. I desire my Examiner to Resolve me one Question; and that is, How this Form could be made use of in Compliance to the Jews, who yet never had such a Form among them as Baptizing in the Name of the Lord? Nay who did not know but Crucified this very Lord into whose Name St. Peter Baptized. This Phrase therefore both here, and in several other Places, doth plainly refer to the Words of the Commission; in which, tho' there is only one Person expressed, the other two are implied; a way of speaking which is very frequent. This we may learn clearly from Acts 19. 2. &c. Where we read that when St. Paul had found certain Disciples, he said unto them, *have ye Received the Holy Ghost since ye Believed?* and they said unto him, *we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost*: and he said unto them, *unto what then were ye Baptized?* and they said unto John's Baptism. From hence it is plain, that the Apostles Question unto what then were you Baptized? Is all one as if he had said; if you had been Baptized with the Christian Form, you must have heard of the Holy Ghost, because you would have been Baptiz'd in his Name. And that they understood him so, is as plain by their Answer; for they tell him they had only been Baptized unto John's Baptism. And yet notwithstanding the Holy Ghost is so plainly mentioned here, it follows only v. 5. that they were Baptiz'd in the Name of the Lord Jesus. But the Father and Holy Ghost must be implied; otherwise St. Paul can't be reconciled in this very Place: For tho' the Father is not directly mentioned, yet if the Holy Ghost is implied in that Phrase of Baptizing in the Name of the Lord Jesus; consequently the Father must too; as being all join'd in the Form prescribed in the Commission. And indeed it is (in my Examiner's Words) a bold Presumption to argue, that the Apostles

would Act in Opposition to so direct a Command as *Matt. 28. 19.* And thus we are come to an End of his two Reasons, why *St. Peter* Baptiz'd these *Gentiles* in Compliance to the *Jews*. By which we may see, this Writer is like a *wild Bull in a Nett*, the more he struggles the faster he is caught; the more he writes, the more he confirms my Assertion. That *when a Man forsakes common Honesty, he is forsaken by common Sense.*

I had told him *pag. 37.* That it was trifling to observe, that this same Apostle defines Baptism, *Not to be the putting away of the filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God; for who doubts this to be the principal Part of Baptism? But that it is not the only Part, this very Apostle's Practice is a sufficient Evidence.* A Man might reasonably expect, that if this Writer did urge this Text as an Argument against Water-Baptism: He should reconcile it with *St. Peter's* Practice, who certainly did Baptize with Water.

But he hath an easier Way of getting loose from an Argument: I may call it *Trifling* or *what I please he cares not, since 'tis such a Truth that I cannot deny.* Now if he means it in any other Sense, than that the Apostle intends the Answer of a good Conscience, as a *principal*, but not the *only Part* of Baptism; I did, and do deny it; and gave my Reason for that denial: But 'twas such a Reason, as he could not deal with; and therefore leaves it to take its Chance. I confirm'd this by a Parallel Text in reference to Circumcision. *Rom. 2. 9.* where it is declared to be *that of the Heart, in the Spirit, and not in the Letter*; and yet it is certain, the *Jews* were *outwardly Circumcised*. His Answer is, that the Apostle intends not *Legal* but *Gospel Circumcision*. By which the *Fathers* understand Baptism, and so (it seems) my Objection vanisheth like *Smoak*.

But what hath this Man to do with the *Fathers*, who blackens them after such a Manner, and will not himself be concluded by their Testimony? now that the Apostle in this Place, particularly intends the *Jews*, and the *Jewish Law*, is plain from the whole Drift of his Argument. Thus *v. 17* Behold thou art called a *Jew*, and restest thy self in the Law! and *v. 25.* For Circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the Law; but if thou be a breaker of the Law, thy Circumcision is made *Uncircumcision*, and again, *v. 28.* He is not a *Jew* which is one *Outwardly*, but he is a *Jew* which is one *Inwardly*; and Circumcision is that of the Heart, &c. From hence it is Evident, that the Apostle's Argument turns here upon

upon the *Jewish*, not the *Christian* Ordinances; and that he opposes in the last Verses, the *Outward* and *Inward* Circumcision: The former (he says) would not make them *Jews*, (so as to profit them any thing) if they were Breakers of the Law; since it was the *Inward* and *Spiritual*, which is productive of Obedience, that would entitle them to the *Praise of God*; and yet 'tis certain, tho' the *Outward* Circumcision could not *singly* do this; the *Inward* could not do it neither under the Law; but *Outward* and *Inward* must be join'd together to make an *Israelite* indeed. I therefore say again, with respect to Baptism; the Application is too easy to be insisted on.

We are now come to the Consideration of 1 Cor. 1. I must set down the Passage at large, to shew the *wicked Liberty* which this Writer takes, in expounding Scripture, to serve a Turn. St. Paul begins thus, v. 12. *Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul Crucified for you? or were you Baptized in the Name of Paul? I thank God, that I Baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius: least any should say that I Baptized in my own Name. And I Baptized also the Household of Stephanus, besides I know not whether I Baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel.* Let it be observed first, that we are both agreed, that St. Paul here intends Water-Baptism. A necessary Consequence of which is, that the *Corinthians in General* were Baptized with Water. This is plain from v. 13. *is Christ divided? was Paul Crucified for you? or were ye Baptized in the Name of Paul?* That is, Christ is not divided: Paul was not Crucified for you but Christ; neither were ye Baptized in the Name of Paul, but of Christ. The Words contain an Affirmation, and a Question: The Affirmation is, that *they were Baptized*. The Question, whether they were Baptized *in the Name of Paul?* So that this Place affords one undeniable Proof, that the *Corinthians* in general were Baptized with Water: And that tho' St. Paul spent his time chiefly in preaching the Gospel, and consequently Baptiz'd but few himself; yet that others had been appointed to that Office: And therefore he having not Baptiz'd them, they could not say, they were Baptiz'd *in the Name of Paul*. And this is plainly the Reason, why he thanks God he had Baptiz'd *so few*; least any should say he had Baptized in his own Name. For Christ sent him not (only) to Baptize but (also) to preach the Gospel. It would be tedious to give all the Parallel Texts

Texts of Scripture, wherein this way of speaking occurs, let a few of them suffice. *Joseph* saith to his Brethren, *it was not you that sent me hither (into Egypt) but God*, Gen. 45. 8. not (only) you, but (also) God; for that his Brethren sold him thither there is no doubt. Our Lord says, *Mar. 9. 37. whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.* Now if I should take this in an *absolute and proper Sense*, it implies a plain Contradiction: as if we received our Saviour, and yet did not receive him. The meaning then must be, not (only) me, but (also) him that sent me. Once more our Saviour says, *Joh. 6. 27. labour not for the Meat that perisheth, but for that Meat which endures to Everlasting Life.* Now the Apostle saith plainly, *he that will not Labour let him not Eat.* So that it is *our Duty* to labour for the Meat that perisheth. We must then of necessity understand it, not (only) for the Meat that perisheth, but (also or principally) for the Meat that endureth to Everlasting Life. Instances of this kind would be endless; but these (I think) are sufficient, to clear the Apostles Meaning.

Let us now take a View, of the goodly Exposition given by my Examiner. He observes *the Divisions of the Church of Corinth were about Persons, in which doubtless their Preaching was as much concern'd as their Baptizing, if not more.* His Inference is, *That if the Apostle had received a Commission from Christ to Baptize, as well as to preach the Gospel, he would no more have thanked God for the neglect of one part of his Commission, than the other.* Now, first here is a Supposition, that the Apostles had a Commission to Teach, and no Commission to Baptize, against plain Matter of Fact; for the very same Text that empowers them to Teach, doth likewise empower them to Baptize, *Mat. 28. 19.* and that this was to be done by *Water Baptism*, I suppose the Reader is by this time satisfied. As therefore the Apostle was Commissioned to Baptize, so here is no Foundation to insinuate, as if he thanked God for the neglect of any part of his Commission; for he certainly put both parts in execution by the most proper Methods. As Preaching the Gospel was a Province of the greatest difficulty, and required the greatest Gifts and Abilities, when Men were to be Converted from Error to the Truth: He (as best qualified) discharg'd that part of his Commission himself; and as no Gifts were required to the Baptizing of Converts, but only a *Lawful Mission*, he could, and did, leave that part chiefly to others: Who accordingly did (as I have shewn) Baptize these *Corinthians*.

So that both parts of the Apostle's Commission were fully executed by himself, or his Substitutes; tho' for the good of Souls, he thought fit to confine himself chiefly to Preaching the Gospel.

But my Examiner observes likewise, that *St. Paul needed not to have feared the Charge of Baptizing in his own Name if his Commission would have born him out.* But who ever imagined his Commission would bear him out in Baptizing in his own Name, when he was so directly Commanded to Baptize in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? To do this, would have prov'd him a Betrayer of his Trust, and a Seducer of the People; a making himself the Author of a Sect. and gaining Profelytes to himself, and not unto Christ: The thoughts of which he entertained with so great an abhorrence, that he thanks God, he had Baptized so few there, that they might not have any handle, to fasten such a vile Imputation upon him.

From hence then it is plain, that the Apostle did not *Baptize as he Circumcised*, to comply with the Circumstances of the Times, but to comply with a positive Precept; which we see he fully discharged, either by Baptizing himself, or deputing others to do it in his stead. Neither can the following words be taken in an absolute and proper Sense, because they would be contradictory to *St. Paul's* own Practice. So that since these *Corinthians* were Baptized, notwithstanding *St. Paul* Baptized so few; the whole Passage taken together, is a full Proof of Water Baptism. But what do I talk of contradicting *St. Paul's* Practice, since (if my Examiner may be believed) the Apostle was *Afraid of being called to an account for it, because Christ did not send him to Baptize.* But I desire to know where he meets with the least intimation of any such fear; or who it was that was to call him to an account? Nor the other Apostles; for they had practised Water Baptism as well as he, as they were plainly obliged to do. These are the *wicked Evasions* which Persons who are resolved to hold out against every Method of Conviction, are forced to fly to. The Holy Apostle must be represented as afraid of being call'd to an Account, and arraign'd as *Erroneous*, rather than they will own themselves in an Error, and yield to the force of Truth. But certainly the Man who can come up to this, must not only have a *desperate Cause*, but a *desperate Conscience*.

His arguing from Circumcision to Baptism by a parity of Reason, hath been so often confuted, that I need say
the

the less here ; for if *St. Paul* Circumcised, though Christ sent him not to Circumcise, yet it will by no means follow, that he might Baptize in the Name of Christ, tho' Christ never gave him any Authority to Baptize in his Name. The first is an Action plainly indifferent ; the last the height of Boldness and Impiety, unless he had a Power from Christ himself. The first he plainly complied with, and at another time as plainly refused : But let my Examiner shew me that he ever refused Baptism, when he was desired to administer it.

His 32d. pag. doth not deserve a serious Answer, being filled with nothing but positive Assertions, without the least Proof to support them. As because Baptism, or Purification with Water was a legal Ceremony ; therefore (if you'll take his Assertion against plain Scripture) Christ did not appoint Water-Baptism as a standing Ordinance of the Gospel.

That *the nearer he approached these Ceremonies with his Affections, the more empty he saw them.* Which proves nothing (that I know of) but that the more he considers things, the less he understands them.

That the Quakers have so much *Scripture, Reason* and *Experience* on their side, that my writing will rather *establish* than stagger them. Here I cannot but drop a Tear, and lament the hard Fate of all Christian Churches, for fifteen Hundred Years and more after Christ ; that none of them should be able to understand the Scriptures, or have the Reason and Experience of my Examiner ; that all these things should be *hid from their Eyes*, till the Founder of the Quakers started up from his Bulk and became an Apostle. Whether my present attempt for their good, may be fruitless or not, I cannot say ; but that they have neither Scripture, Reason, or Experience for them, will, I believe, before I end this, be very evident to every unbiassed Reader.

That the Apostles would not have used Water-Baptism in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, unless Christ had Commanded them, I acknowledge ; and that therefore it is not natural to our Religion, but of positive Institution ; tho' what good the granting this can do my Examiner, I am at a loss to know. I likewise urged, that our Lord, if he pleased, might certainly adopt Water-Baptism, and make it a standing Ordinance of his own Religion, if he thought fit. This is what he doth not deny, but thinks to come off by giving *hard Names* ; by declaring it an *Inversion of the Order and Nature of things, to call the Rites*
and

and Ceremonies of the Servant, to dwell in the House of his Son, &c. But let me tell him again, there's no arguing against Matter of Fact; that we have plain Commands for our Christian Sacraments, is evident. The Application therefore of any Terms to them, which are given to the *Jewish Ceremonies in general*, that were numerous and burthensome, is not only *absurd* but *prophane*: And if they are of Divine Appointment under the Gospel, as (if Words can express a Command) they certainly are; then to say the calling them to dwell there, is an *Inversion of the Nature and Order of Things*, is so far from being an Argument, that it is a *down-right and daring Attack upon the living God*.

I desire the Reader to peruse his 33 and 34 pag. in order to form a true Notion of the *Virulence and Prophaneness* of this petulant Writer, as to what he urges again, that the word Water is not mentioned *Mat. 28. 19*, and consequently that Water-Baptism is not enjoind: I think I have thoroughly laid open that groundless Evasion already. But when he comes to speak of the Commission, by which (I said) the Apostles were empowered to administer it, he makes not the least reply, but instead of it, gives this *prophane Description* of one of the Holy Sacraments, which the Blessed Jesus commanded us to use, to become Members of his Church. *What (says he) to send Holy Water from the tops of the Fingers of a Man, so holy as the Parson, to the Forehead of an Infant to regenerate it? And inspire it with Courage as a valiant Soldier of Christ, by virtue of a Popish Cross made in its Forehead? A vain Whim!* Now if our Holy Redeemer hath enjoind this Ordinance, for the Admission of Christian Profelytes, he hath (according to this Writer) enjoined a *vain Whim*; and if the Apostles acted in Conformity to this Injunction, and Baptized with Water; (as they undeniably did) they likewise imposed a *vain Whim* upon their Followers, for a Sacrament; nay, that his Impiety may be compleat, he takes care his Burlesque may run in the *Scripture Phrase*, where Baptism is called, the *Washing of Regeneration*. As to the Sign of the Cross, it is known we do not look upon it, as of the *Essence* of Baptism, or ascribe any Efficacy to it, but use it only as a *Commemorative Sign*, and therefore we omit it in private Baptism, where yet our Rubrick declares the Child *sufficiently Baptized*; and we are not to be frightened by his calling it *Popish* (a Bugbear-word which is to be hook'd in upon all Exigencies) since we can prove the use of it in the first and purest

purest Ages of Christianity, long before Popery had any Footing in the World.

The same is likewise to be said of the Succession in the Ministry, which is not derived from the Pope, but the Apostles of Christ; and if the Church of *Rome* acknowledges both this and other Truths, among a great many Errors and Corruptions: I hope we must not grow so mad, as to jumble Truth and Errour together, and lay the Truth aside, for fear of being *Followers of the Pope*.

His next Pretence against outward Ordination, is taken from his common Refuge (when he wants a support from Lying and Slandering) the Vicious and Debauch'd Principles and Practices of *too many of the Protestant Clergy*; to daub which over a little, we have likewise added the *Papist Clergy*.

Here he calls in his *Fidus Achates*, the Author of the Rights, who observes the Clergy suggest, *The Spiritual Power runs as clearly through their Fingers ends into the Noddles of all they lay their Hands on, as Water through a Conduit Pipe*. A Comment, I suppose, on those words of the Apostle, 1 Tim. 5. 22. *Lay hands suddenly on no Man*. Or, Ch. 4. 14. *Neglect not the Gift which is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*. Or, 2 Tim. 1. 6. *Stir up the Gift that is in thee, by the putting on of my Hands*. Or, Tit. 1. 5. *For this Cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee*. Here then again (as well as in the Case of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism) we have a plain *Scriptural Institution* turned into Ridicule, by this *hopeful Christian*, who talks so loudly of *Temper and Moderation*. But now, if the Apostles did Ordain to the Ministry, by Imposition of Hands, and commanded, that others should be Ordained in the like manner; if this likewise hath been in Fact, the Usage of the Christian Churches of all Nations, for several Hundred Years after Christ, who have born one continued Testimony to the Apostolical Injunctions: What Argument can it be against these Commands, (if our Author's Assertion was as true, as it is false) that many of the Clergy are *vicious and debauched*. Certainly the proper Remedy for that, is to *punish the Men*, and not *rally the Function*, which is so evidently of Apostolical Institution. But alas! what is there so sacred, which may not become the Subject of Ridicule, as well as the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, and the solemn Apostolical Appointment of outward Ordination

tion, to Men that will allow themselves in this *abominable Licentiousness* of Writing? What if the Question should be started, whether the Blood of Christ can take away Sins, by any *Inherent Virtue*, or *Natural Efficiency*? Might not a Man find room even here for *wicked Drollery*, if he would follow my Examiner's Example, and place himself *in the seat of the scornful*? And yet we must acknowledge, with the utmost Thankfulness, that the Holy Jesus *hath paid*, and God *hath accepted*, this Ransom for the Sins of the World. Such Diabolical Reasoning as this, favours of *Apostacy* instead of *Argument*, and declares him that makes use of it, like Solomon's Madman, *Prov. 26. 18, 19. Who casteth Firebrands, Arrows, and Death, and saith, am not I in sport?* And yet after all, how are they who plead for the *inward Call only* (which we likewise require in conjunction with the outward) secured better from being scandalous Livers? Are the Friends all of them *Saints*? And is the *pure Seed* so generally among them, that they have *no fellowship with the Works of Darknes*? Here the Reader may imagine, I could easily return my Examiner's Complements to the Clergy; but I look upon such sort of Retaliation to be very unbecoming *when it is true*; but very wicked *when it is false*, as his (I am fully persuaded) is. And indeed I am so far from having business with any one but himself, that I will not receive any thing as an Answer to this, but what comes to me, subscrib'd by *Thomas Beaven, Junior.*

To him therefore I apply my self to shew, that a Teacher may be scandalous in his Principles and Practices *among them*, as well as *amongst us*. If you should ask him, whether he is satisfied in his Call to be a Speaker, and that it is not *by Man*, but *by the Holy Ghost*, I doubt not but he hath *Confidence enough* to answer, yes: And yet let him talk as long as he will of the many scandalous Persons among the Clergy, who have received *outward Ordination*; yet he may take his Horse and ride the Kingdom over, and not be able to find one among them all, *equally scandalous with himself.*

His observing that I put *Conversion* before *Baptism*, signifies just nothing to his purpose, who denies Baptism in general both to *Infants* and *Adult Persons*; and yet tho' the Apostles must Convert the *Parents* before they could Baptize them; that did not hinder, but they might afterwards proceed to Baptize *their Children also*. But he wants to know, if I mean that none but those who are so washed, are *Members of Christ's Church*? I have told him before, that they are not, according to the *Terms of the Gospel Dispensation.*

And

And what Answer doth he return? Why he must *beg leave to dissent from that uncharitable Opinion.* A killing Answer indeed! And yet I could forgive him for this, because I believe he is not able *to return a better.* But his shameful misrepresentation of Baptism, which he makes in the following Lines, is not *so easily to be forgiven*; for do we any where affirm, that *no body that is Baptized can miss of Heaven?* Do we not affirm Baptism to be a Covenant between God and us? That we are obliged to perform our Conditions, and that then, and not otherwise, God will make good his? This is so plain and notorious to the meanest Capacity, that one would think, a Man could never have the Forehead to assert the contrary, who was under any restraints, either of *Modesty or Conscience.*

But if I will not be angry, a Man of his mean reading may tell me what the Learned say, that the Greek *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* is *into the Name.* It would be very severe indeed, to be angry with him for this: He hath made bold to write, or at least to get some body to write, about five Greek words more from the Book of this same Learned Friend, and yet I am so far from being angry with him, that I should be glad if he *knew more*; for 'tis to be hoped, he would then blush to see the weakness of his own Arguments.

But he goes on; and that *the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, into which they were by their Ministry commanded to Baptize, is the Power and Virtue of the Father, &c. not the Element of Water.* As if we imagined they were commanded to Baptize *into the Element of Water.* What we say, is, that they were to Baptize *with Water, in, or into the Name of the Father, &c.* Now my Examiner declares, that the *Name* is the same as the *Power or Virtue*; and abundance of Texts are referr'd to, to justify that Exposition. I (on the other hand) affirm, it signifies *the Person*, Acts 9. 14. *He must suffer for my Name's sake, or my sake.* Our Lord is declared, Eph. 1. 21. *To be exalted above every Name that is named, or every Person.* So throughout the Bible, *To praise thy Name, is to praise thee. Let every one that nameth the Name of Christ, or nameth Christ.* Nay, I have taken the pains to search all the Texts quoted by my Examiner, and find that all of them *may*, and some of them *must* be thus interpreted. So that the words amount to thus much. *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, washing them with Water, into the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.* That this Phrase *into the Name*, must signify the Person; I could shew by many other Texts: And I believe my Examiner will hardly find those,

those, where it must necessarily signifie the *Power* or *Virtue*, and yet if he will allow it to be a *Form of Words* to be us'd in Baptism (as the Apostles plainly understood it to be, and made use of it accordingly) we will not fall out about the Interpretation of the Phrase.

But (it seems) I have spent Part of my 39, 40 p. only in a Misapplication of Tit. 3. 5. I must again desire the Reader to turn to those Pages, and see whether there are not several other Arguments made use of besides this one which he thinks fit to mention. I first cleared that Part of the Commission, *I am with you to the End of the World*, from the Socinian Objections, and shewed it must be interpreted *till the Consummation of all things*. I consider'd the Apostolical Practice, and proved from several Texts of Scripture, that they Baptized with Water. I desired him likewise to shew out of the New Testament so plain a Command for Circumcision, or any other abolish'd *Jewish Rite*; as I had done for Baptism; to support his vain Pretence that they were upon an equal Foot: I consider'd also his ridiculous Assertion, that the Apostles Baptized in Compliance with the *Jews*; upon which I argued thus: *Why have we no mention of it in the New Testament? The Controversies about this Subject have a large Place in the Holy Writings; St. Paul as he was the Apostle, so he was the Champion of the Gentiles in this Case: and can we think that he who withstood St. Peter to his Face, and pleaded their Cause at Jerusalem with so much firmness, would not only have been silent in the Case of these two Ordinances, if they had in reality been no more obligatory than the rest, but have been also an Administrator of them himself?* And now is all this nothing but a Misapplication of Tit. 3. 5? Certainly if this Writer himself makes no Distinction between *Truth* and *Falshood*, yet he ought to consider he owes so much to his Reader, as not to abuse him in such a scandalous Manner. If he cannot Reply to this, let him fairly own it; or at least let him slip it over quietly, and not palm an Untruth upon his Reader, and pretend here is nothing but only a Misapplication of one particular Text.

Well! But how hath my Examiner proved that I have misapplied Tit. 3. 5? Why he hath gone as far in it, as his own Confidence can reach, but as for any thing like Argument, he hopes for your Excuse. He declares to you, it signifies the *Inward Washing*, and a quickening the Soul to a new Life of Holiness: And is not his bare saying so, Proof enough to manifest my Weakness? But I must not
E impote

(50)
 upon my Reader at this Rate, and do therefore offer the following Reason, why *Washing* is to be taken here in the *literal Sense*; and that is, because there is no room to plead for a figurative Interpretation, since outward Washing in order to our *Regeneration*, is so far from *Contradicting*, that it exactly agrees with other Texts of Scripture. Thus our Lord tells *Nicodemus*. John 3. 3. *Except a man be born again (or regenerated) he cannot see the Kingdom of God.* And what he means by this Phrase, he discovers clearly V. 5. *Except a man be born of Water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* A Text, among many others, fit to be considered by those, who are so wretchedly seduc'd as to deny Water-Baptism. I could fortifie this with other Arguments, but as the *plain proper Sense* is what I contend for, I leave my Examiner to assign his Reasons why we must necessarily depart from it.

In my last Paragraph (he says) I shew how ready I am to sue, that the Quakers may be restrain'd from the Liberty of Pen and Ink, and have clean Straw and a dark Room. Now this is so far from Truth that I confine my Supposition only to a *single Person*: And if my Examiner will say, "That not only the Apostles, but all Christian Churches since have mistaken our Saviours Commission, and we must learn the Meaning of it from the Quakers: (which was the first Part of my Supposition, and which he left out according to his usual Sincerity) I am still of Opinion such a Restraint would be proper for such a Disputant: Nay, I will add this farther, That if any one had provided such a Place for him, before he had set Pen to Paper, it would have been so far from an Act of Cruelty, that they had undoubtedly done him a very *Charitable Office*: And as the worthy Person whom he Reflects upon, without any Provocation, is (I dare say) very easy under his Calumny; so I shall make no Apology for him, because I am sure he needs none: I only think my self obliged to disclaim his having any hand in my mean Work, because he himself would be the Sufferer by such an Imputation. And upon the whole, I desire to leave one general Consideration to this Writer's serious Thoughts; That as there are some who take care to make such a Passage through the World, that their Memories will have a sweet Savour long after their Dissolution; so there are others who fall

so far into the contrary Extreme, that they sink in the Nostrils of all good Men, even while they are alive.

It is now time to take a short Review of this Argument. To begin then with what he hath advanced which is Foreign to the Purpose. Under which Head must be placed

1st All his Arguments drawn from Circumcision or any other Jewish Rites, and also all Texts in the new Testament which speak of them as abolished, or of no Force; since we profess our Obligation to the Christian Sacraments, to arise from the positive Command of Christ himself.

2^d. His Instances out of the new Testament, of abstaining from things strangled, and from Blood; and anointing the sick with Oyl in the Name of the Lord; The first enjoin'd by the Apostles, not as Duties of lasting Obligation, but only for the sake of Peace and Unity, and to compose a present Difference, the Compliance with which afterwards ceased, when the Reason of the Injunction was at an end: The last, a Custom sometimes used, sometimes disused among the Apostles, and in Process of Time laid aside, being abus'd to unlawful Purposes; neither of them Instituted by Christ, or made a Means of Grace, as both our Sacraments evidently are, and therefore cannot be disused: For tho' indifferent Things may be taken away at the Discretion of our Governours, yet those which are Essential cannot, and if corrupted, must only be purged from such Corruption and restored to their primitive Institution.

What directly concerns this Subject is, 1st, The Commission from Christ to Baptize, *Matth.* 28. 19. this I have shewn in the plain literal Sense to imply Water-Baptism, and also that the Apostles did both understand it so, and practise accordingly, by Baptizing with Water. And as to his Objection,

That Christ's Baptism is said to be *with the Holy Ghost*, and *with Fire*; I have shewn, That this was a Promise made to the Apostles, and plainly fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost; the Holy Ghost descending in the Shape of *Cloven Fiery Tongues*: That as these extraordinary Effusions were likewise given to others (tho' never in the Shape of Fire) yet this was not adjudged by the Apostles to be the Baptism commanded, *Matth.* 28. 19. and that for this plain Reason, because they ordered the Persons who were

possessed of them, to be baptized with Water, as in the Case of *Cornelius*; and at other times administred Water-Baptism first, and afterwards laid hands on them, upon which the Holy Ghost was miraculously Given, as in the Case of the *Ephesians*. Their being then thus plainly distinguished from Baptism, is an evident Sign that these Gifts were not designed for that Baptism which was to continue in the Church; and indeed it is clear as to Fact, That as they were first bestowed for the Conviction of Unbelievers, and the quick Progress and Promulgation of the Gospel: So they did actually cease when that End was attained: and that all Christian Churches, did continue in the use of the *outward Baptism*, as knowing it the only perpetual Means which Christ had appointed to make them Members of his Body; and communicate to them such ordinary Measures of Grace, as would be sufficient (with their own sincere Endeavours) to bring them to Eternal Happiness.

His next Objection, that the Apostles administred Water-Baptism *to comply with the Jews*; is nothing but an empty precarious Assertion, without the least Countenance from any Text of Scripture. On the contrary, the very Form which they used, shews plainly, they did it in compliance with a positive Command of our blessed Saviour. The short Result of all, is this;

Whether this plain Command of Christ, back'd as plainly with Apostolical Practice, and that followed with the concurrent Usage of all Christian Churches; doth not lay an indispensable Obligation upon us to use it likewise? The Case, I think, is so evident, that I willingly submit it to every *sincere Lover of Truth*.

Of the Lord's Supper with Bread and Wine.

IF the Reader hath a Desire to see the Picture of a Man who is resolv'd to maintain a Dispute, tho' he hath neither one tolerable Argument to produce for himself, nor a tolerable Answer to return to those which are urg'd against him by his Opponent; I recommend to his serious Perusal, this Part of my Examiner's Performance: And only desire him to read my Reflections, Paragraph by Paragraph, and then likewise observe, how much he hath wholly slept over, and how notoriously shuffling he is in his pretended Replies.

He begins with telling me I have bestow'd near a Page, and a half *about his Citations out of Godwin, &c. to very little purpose.* My Design in those Pages was to shew; First That he Abuses *Godwin*, by quoting him *Peace-meal*, and making Objections out of him., which *Godwin* himself answers in the very Places from whence these Objections are drawn; and which Answers my Examiner *very honestly Conceals.* Secondly, to shew, That these Objections, tho' they were true, are yet nothing to his present Business; And this, I think, is to very good Purpose, and might have deserved some of his Notice.

The first Thing that he insists upon, is my owning that this Custom of Breaking Bread and Drinking Wine, *was used when the Passover was Celebrated.* I am very ready to own this again; and do tell him withal, it will not do the least Service to his Cause. But now for the Interrogatories; *Did Christ bring any of the Types or Figures of the Law into the Gospel?* I told him this Question was wide of his Mark, as proceeding upon a false Supposition; the Bread and Wine here alluded to, being *no Type or Figure of Christ.* Certainly then (says he) *he ought to have proved it.* And so goes on in his *humble Strain*, to Jest with his *Ipse Dixit* and *Verbum Sacerdotis.* And indeed this is a Trick my Examiner hath got, to suppose a Thing which is false, and then put me upon proving the Negative: Whereas, according to the Laws of Reason and Argument, it is he *who Affirms* a Thing that ought to prove it, and not he *who denies it.* But upon this Occasion, I shall make bold to Transcribe a Passage in my 43 P. *To be no longer reserv'd with our Author, I will now shew him the Capital Mistake which hath led him into all this false Reasoning; and that is, his Asserting this Ceremony of Bread and Wine, in Use among the Jews, to have been the Type of Christ our Passover; whereas, in Truth, it was the Lamb slain, that was the Type of Christ: In allusion to which, he is plainly called, John 1. 29. the Lamb of God; and a Lamb without Blemish, 1 Pet. 1. 19. The Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World, Rev: 13. 8. And indeed this Ceremony was so far from being a Type of Christ, our Passover, that tho' all Particulars relating to this Ordinance,, are so minutely set down in both the Institutions of it; Ex. 12. and Deut. 16. Yet there is not one word about breaking the Bread, and drinking the Cup, here alluded to; and it is plainly an additional Rite to that Ordinance. And is all this nothing but an Ipse Dixit? Tho' after all, my Ipse Dixit had been sufficient; it being his Business to prove*

his own Supposition. I believe the Reader will feel some Indignation rise in his Breast, to see the shameless Effrontry of this Writer; who because he was not able to Reply, thought to bear it off with a Jest, and make it be believed there was nothing to Reply to.

We are both agreed as to his second Interrogatory; and as to his third, it proceeds upon the same false Supposition with the first: That the breaking of Bread and drinking of Wine in Use among the *Jews*, was a Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ. Whether I have not proved it to be false, the Reader must judge: tho' I must again observe, *it lies upon him* to prove it to be true. And as to the *Faculty of distinguishing*, which he mentions; I must remind him, it is *safer for the Government* that the Oaths should be taken even with that Distinction, than *not taken at all*; or that any Security should be so far from being given, that Orders should be made, in *direct Opposition to the Laws of the Kingdom*.

But he proceeds to observe, That the rest of my 42 and 43 (to which let me add, and 44, and 45 P. for he hath leaped over all of them together, without replying to any thing but his Greek Criticism) contain little, besides Citations out of his 2d Thoughts, and a few trifling Observations that are nothing to the Purpose. I must entreat the Reader to give those Pages another View, and then he will see how many Things he hath quite dropt the Defence of. If they were nothing to his Purpose, he was to blame to urge them at first; and indeed this was that I had told him before, in my Reflections p. 45. *That I was willing to follow him through this part of his Performance (concerning Jewish Rites) that the Quakers might not call it unanswerable: Tho' if a direct Command for these Ordinances can be produced out of the new Testament, and the Apostles Practice prov'd Conformable, this is a full Decision of the Case.* Nay that if our Lord had enjoind his Disciples to kill a Lamb every Year, and eat in Remembrance of his Death; the Pretence that this was used by the Jews as a Type of Christ, would never have excused us for not complying with a positive Precept.

This he passes over among what he calls my Trifling Observations: and jogs on still without Remorse with his old Argument, of its being but a Jewish Rite; and quotes Mr. Lesly again to shew, That the legal Types and Ceremonies accompanying them are fulfilled in the Gospel; and then, having quoted me also, as owning the Pass-

ver a Type of Christ, and this a Ceremony accompanying it ; and that the Meat and Drink mentioned Col. 2. 16. is abolished. He asks, with what Reason I plead for this Jewish Rite which is confessedly abolished? Now if the Reader can put me in any Way, whereby I may reach this Man's Understanding or his Conscience ; it would save both him and me a great deal of Trouble. I have told him over and over, as plain as I could find Words to express it, that I do not plead for the Observation of the Lords Supper as a Jewish Rite. I know as well as he it would not oblige us as such. My Plea for the Necessity of its Observance is founded on its being Instituted and Commanded by Christ, and Practis'd by the Apostles ; and it is upon this Bottom I am ready to join Issue with my Examiner, as to our Obligation both to the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.

But he is resolv'd not to come to this plain Issue if he can avoid it ; and therefore amuses his Reader with Types, and Shadows, and Ceremonies ; which have not the least Relation to our Dispute. Accordingly we may observe that after he hath asked p. 33 ; with what Reason I plead for the Observance of this Jewish Rite? He returns this Answer for me: *Because our Saviour said of it (this Jewish Rite) do this in Remembrance of me.*

I am sorry this Writer's frequent Prevarication should oblige me so often to trouble the Reader, to turn to my Reflections: In my 45 p. (which is neglected by him as fill'd with *Trifling Observations*) I had given the several Relations at large of St. Mat. St. Mark, and St. Luke, of the Institution of this Supper, by our blessed Saviour himself, to which I refer: and from them I argued thus. " Let an unprejudic'd Reader consider these Accounts, and tell me ; whether this Rite which was borrowed from the Jews is not now solemnly appointed to another Use than it had before? Could the Jews say from the Old Testament when they eat this Bread that it was an Emblem of Christ's Body, or when they drank this Cup that it was the New Testament or Covenant in his Blood? No, this could never be said, never was thought of till Christ Instituted both for this Holy End.

Here then I fix my Foot: From hence I aver the Institution of this Sacrament to be from Christ ; to be Instituted by him to an End and Purpose perfectly New, and both unheard, and thought of to the Jews ; and

consequently that it cannot be call'd a Jewish Rite, or be adjudged abolished as such ; for this plain Reason ; Because it is a *Gospel Ordinance* undeniably appointed by our Lord himself. And now I leave the Reader to judge of this Writer's Integrity, in slipping over all this without one Word of Answer ; and pretending to place it among my *Trifling Observations* ; when it is the *very Heart and Ground* of the whole Controversie between him and me : Nay which is worse than all, in fallily suggesting as if I had affirmed, that it was only of an *abolished Jewish Rite*, that our Lord said, *do this in Remembrance of me* ; when I had so plainly proved, that he said it of *that Bread and Wine in particular*, which he then ordain'd to be eaten as an Emblem of his own Body and Blood ; and which was never before ordain'd for that purpose : which must therefore be a Christian, and not a Jewish Institution ; since it is plain in Fact, that the Jews never either eat Bread, or drank Wine, as a Commemoration of *this Sacrifice for the Sins of the World*. I do therefore call upon my Examiner to speak directly to this point, when he *writes next* : and let him not think to come off, by saying the Jews had the Custom of eating Bread and drinking Wine at the Passover, (that no Body doubts :) but let him prove, they eat and drank it *as an Annunciation of Christ's Death* : If not, then though the *same Symbols* are used, the *different End* must make it a *different Institution* : Nay tho' he could prove, (which yet he cannot) that the Jews used the *same Symbols*, for the *same End* ; yet if Christ enjoin'd them *anew* under the Gospel, we certainly are bound to comply with that Injunction.

My Examiner had said in his 2d. Thoughts ; that *do this &c.* might very well be understood, *to be meant only that time*, without any Violence offered to the Place ; which he would persuade you, *I seem'd not to argue against* ; and yet I had urg'd two Arguments against this silly Interpretation p. 46. One of which shews it to be *absurd*, the other *impossible*. The first is, that our Lord was *there present with them*, and that therefore there could be no need of *Instituting any Action to be remembred by*, if it was to last no longer than *the present Time* : and that this was so plain, that to argue it would be to offer *Violence to the Readers Patience*.

The second was, from the *new Revelation* that St Paul received concerning this Sacrament, after our Lord's *Ascension*

cension: From whence I there argue thus; *What Occasion was there for any Instructions, or new Revelation about it, if it was now at an End, and design'd for no longer Continuance, than that one Time wherein our Saviour Celebrated it himself?* Here again the poor Man was quite gravell'd; the Arguments are so clear, as not to admit of a Reply; and therefore he slides them over, and very *Reputably* tells his Reader, that I *did not seem to argue against it*: Nay he hath made a farther Step than this, and Reprinted this very Argument of his in the next Page, as neither *fully nor fairly Answered*; tho' it is plain my Answers are so full, that he himself could not find an *Evasion*. What a Blessing it is to a Man to have a *shining Forehead*! But tho' he is forced from one *Hold*, he will fly to another; and can now tell me what the *Learned* say. I presume, he means the *Learned Friends*; for I verily believe he will find great Difficulty to meet with one Commentator besides, who hath *perverted this Text at such a Rate*. First then we are given to understand, That the Verb *ποιεῖτε* is of the Indicative Mood; let me add, and of the Imperative Mood too; and therefore may be rendered either way, where the Sense and Context do not determine us.

Secondly, That the Word *ἀνάμνησις* does *sometimes* signify *Acceptance or Notice taking*; I add, and *more than sometimes Remembrance*; which is the primary and genuine Sense of it, as any one may see who is able to turn a *Lexicon*: To which agree these Phrases, among a Multitude of others in the Scriptures: *Of making a Man's Remembrance to Cease, and to Perish; and Cutting off his Remembrance*. What then are we to do, if the Verb is really of *both Moods*, and the Word may be taken in *both Senses*? The only way is, to Consider the Context and the Sense; and enquire into any other Places of Scripture which speak professedly of the Subject under Debate. This is what my Examiner hath declined, and yet Triumphs at the bottom of his Paragraph, as if he had gained a Victory. *What then is become (says he) of the plain Command and Institution, he would Impose upon his Reader?* That here is a *plain Command* for this Sacrament, I did indeed, and do Assert; but that *the Institution* of it is contained in these Words, I was never so Shallow to Affirm, tho' my Examiner hath *the Assurance* to say so. But it is time to proceed farther in this Matter, since no Doubt can be determined by such Arguments as these: I will therefore compare this *Interpretation* of his, with St. Paul's Account, 1 Cor. 11. 23.

&c. because it is the Fullest, and will most plainly shew his Perversion of Holy Writ. That Account then consists of *two Parts* ; of what our Lord *did*, and of what he *said*. He took Bread, and gave Thanks, and brake it ; after the same manner also, he took the Cup, when he had supped. What he says to them, is this ; *Take, Eat, this is my Body, which is broken for you ; This do in Remembrance of me. This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me.* Now in this Speech of our Lord, here are *Three Verbs* plainly Connected together ; λαβετε, φάγετε, πινετε, That is, say I, *Take, Eat, Do.* My Examiner would render the last of them, *Ye do.* The short Question is, since they are all clearly of one Mood, Whether it must be the Indicative or Imperative ? My Answer is, it must be the *Imperative*, because λαβετε can't be found in the *Indicative Mood*. The Rhetoricians call this an *Asyndeton*, when several Words are joined together without the Conjunction Copulative ; as *Veni, Vidi, Vici.*

But the other Objection is, that ἀνάμνησις must not be rendred *Remembrance*. Let us first then consider the Sense that my Examiner hath put upon these Words : *Ye do this unto my Acceptance or Notice taking* ; now this rendring makes them wholly Insignificant : For since our Saviour himself Blessed the Bread and Wine, and gave it to the Apostles, and commanded them to *Eat and Drink it* : No doubt, but their Compliance must be to his *Acceptance or Notice taking*, whether he had told them so or not. Tho' we need not insist upon this, because St. Paul hath put a Final End to the Dispute in the Place mentioned, for having set down the Command, *this do Ye in Remembrance of me*, He immediately explains the Words thus. *For as oft as Ye Eat this Bread and Drink this Cup, Ye do shew the Lords Death, till he comes.* Where it is evident that the *Remembrance of Christ, and shewing the Lords Death*, are made use of as *Phrases of the same Import* : and therefore if St. Paul is to be adhered to, before this *Learned Expofitor*, we are commanded by our Redeemer to do this, *not to his Acceptance or Notice taking*, but for a *Memorial of his Death*. And if so, the Verb must be taken *Imperatively* ; because it cannot have Relation only to their *Eating at that Time* ; but is designed for a *Standing Command* to succeeding Generations.

But now for the two Reprinted Paragraphs : Matthew and Mark (says he) mention only Matter of Fact, that Christ did Eat the Passover without saying of Eating the Bread,

Do this in Remembrance of me, as Luke does. And is this then *all the Matter of Fact*, which *Matthew* and *Mark* mention, that Christ did Eat this Passover? Do they not *directly affirm*, that he took Bread, and said, *Take, Eat, this is my Body*; and also the Cup, saying, *this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is Shed for many*? and was this ever said of the Bread and Wine used after the Passover? On the contrary, are they not both plainly Consecrated to a New End; which must make it a New Institution? What can a Man do, with such an incorrigible Falsifier, and Perverter of Scripture. Now from this Silence of *St. Matthew*, and *St. Mark*, as to the following Command: He infers, that they did not believe the Institution (which yet they themselves so punctually relate) to be a sealing Ordinance of the Gospel. The very Spirit of Scepticism seems to have possess'd him; otherwise he would never urge such far fetch'd Arguments as these, against a positive Institution, which was so plainly complied with by the Apostles themselves. And I must tell him farther, that if those Words, *Do this in Remembrance of me*, had not been recorded by *St. Luke* and *St. Paul*; yet our Lords Institution is so plain, and the Apostles Practice so Indisputable, as to lay a manifest Obligation on us all, even without the subsequent Command; which seems to be the true Reason why *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark* omitted it, because they look'd upon all Christians sufficiently obliged without it. But he goes on Triumphantly. From which 'tis evident. From what I pray doth this Evidence arise? Why? Because *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark* have not set down these Words of our Lord, *Do this in Remembrance of me*, (tho' both *St. Luke* and *St. Paul* have) therefore 'tis Evident they had Relation only to that Time of their eating together.

To Ballance this doughty Argument, which even in dubious Cases, is but a probable one at best; and in this surely no Argument at all; I had shewn (as before) that such a Sense was both absur'd and impossible; to this he makes not the least reply, but putting his Trust in his Face, reprints his own lilly Conjecture as neither fully nor fairly answered; certainly such a Man must be of a peculiar Make.

His next Stroak is even bolder than this: And the Argument against its being a standing Ordinance of the Gospel Church, turns upon the extravagant Flights of his own shatter'd Brain. He knows the Mind of Christ so exactly, that he fancies he can tell you what he would have done, if he had designed this a standing Ordinance.

He

He would, forsooth, have "been more full and express
 " upon this Head, and told them whether they must Eat
 " the whole Passover, or Bread and Wine only; and
 " whether they must Eat it once a Year, as the Jews
 " did, or oftner; and that the same should remain for
 " ever for an Ordinance to his Church in all Generati-
 " ons. Moses (*it seems*) did so, and is said to be faithful
 " in all his House: " And therefore my Examiner very
Religiously Insinuates that the Son of God, (if he intended
 to perpetuate this as a Sacrament) hath been *less faithful*
in his House. And is not this a *blessed Way of Arguing*
 that because our Lord did not (as he thinks) deter-
 mine *some Particulars* in Relation to the Action, accord-
 ing to his own *Crazy Fancy*; therefore the Action it self
 (tho' the Scriptures positively declare otherwise) is not
 binding upon us, as of Divine Institution? Or because
 he is not so distinct as *Moses was as to Circumstances*,
 (which are designedly couched only in general Precepts in
 the New Testament, and the Particulars left to the Wisdom
 of our Governours) therefore *he is less faithful in his*
House. and yet after all, *two* of these Heads which he
 mentions, are plainly enough determined, to any one
 who is not in love with Cavilling. For since our Lord
 took Bread and Wine *only*, and said, *this is my Body and*
Blood: what can be more Clear, than that they were for
 the Future, *to use only Bread and Wine*, as it is evident in
 Fact they did? Again, since he said of it, *Do this in Re-*
membrance of me: Is it not plain that he design'd the out-
 ward Action should continue as long as he *ought to be*
Remembred? and is not that *to all Generations*? And I
 must acquaint him farther, that the Apostles making use
 of Bread and Wine only, without *joining the Passover with*
it, after this Institution; is such a strong Argument as
 he cannot Answer, that they did it in Compliance to our
 Lords Command, and not as a *Jewish Rite*.

His next Paragraph hath likewise received an Answer
 in my 48 page. I there gave him the Reason why St.
John's Account of this Institution *was so short*: But if a
 Man will have the Face to *Print and Reprint*, and take
 no Notice of what is Urged against him, who can help
 it? And as to his Instance of our Lords Washing his
 Disciples Feet; I told him we had as plainly the Apostles
 on our side, for *not looking on this as a Binding Precept*;
 who were never afterwards found in the Practice of Washing
 one anothers Feet; as we had for our receiving the Institu-

tion of the Lords Supper *as such*: Since it is so evident in the Scripture, that they did comply with it, and gave so many special Rules and Directions about it. But this is to pass I suppose among *my trifling Observations*, because it cannot receive a Reply: And so (to his Honour be it spoken) he Reprints his own Passage, (with *all the Modesty in the World*) without returning one Word of Answer to my Argument! Indeed the *latio pedum* was never any Religious Observance, but only a common Custom in those hot Countries, where travelling must necessarily be *Galling and Painful*; and was reckoned after they Enter'd any House, as the first Mark of Hospitality. Our Saviour therefore condescends to perform it to his Disciples; to instruct them, that he who was the *greatest* among them, must be *as the least*; and not decline the *Lowest Office*: But that he did not intend it as a *Standing Ordinance* is beyond Controversie, because the Apostles (who certainly knew the Mind of Christ) are never so much as once Recorded to have practis'd it to one another. And yet this Writer would set it upon the same Foot with Baptism and the Lords Supper; tho' we have such frequent Mention in the New Testament, that the Apostles did undeniably Administer these Sacraments; and also such numerous Declarations of the Benefits we receive from them. Tho' after all, if he could convince us, that our Lord intended this as a Binding Command *upon* upon us; it would do him *no Service* in the present Case: Because the Consequence would only be, that we *must obey it*, (as we do in Relation to the Sacraments) and *Wash one anothers Feet*.

But he thinks some Advantage may be taken, of an Expression in my 49 p. and that is to make amends, for *flying from the Argument*. I there put him in Mind of the Difference between a *positive Precept*, and a *bare Example*. To this he replies, *as if Christ's Saying, Ye ought to Wash one anothers Feet, was no Precept? Is not this like a Doctor, to call this a bare Example?* Now for *all this Liveliness*, it is plain, I have said no more than our Lord himself: For doth not he immediately qualifie the foregoing Words thus: *I have given You an Example, that Ye should do as I have done to You*. And doth not the Apostles Practice clearly shew, that they did not look upon the Words *as Preceptive*; since they never (as we read) perform'd the Action. But I say likewise. *He that bath the necessary Virtue of Humility, effectually answers all that our*
Blessed

Blessed Lord enjoin'd him to imitate by that Action. Here, seems, I am guilty of a Contradiction, in making it an *Example*, and in saying before, it was a bare *Example*. But do I apply these *Two Terms* to the same Thing? On the contrary, do I not say that in Washing his Disciples Feet he shew'd them an *Example* of Humility; and under that *Example* enjoined the *Virtue* it self? And is not this very Consistent? But now he comes over me with an *Argumentum ad Hominum*. A Sort of Argument I confess never heard of before: Nor did I expect to find it here after I have Received to many of his Books from himself with new Corrections. We will suppose, if he had understood Latin but very Little, he would have put it *Hominem*; and then it is built upon a Parity of Reason; (which he hath the worst Luck at of any Man that ever wrote) He (saith my Examiner) that bath the Grace of Remembrance bring the Death, and sufferings of our Saviour for us; effectually answers the End of imitating the Outward Supper. Which Outward Supper may then be as Justifiably disused by the one, as Washing one anothers Feet by the other: Since daily Experience tells us, the Need there is of being put in Mind of Humility, as well as of the Duty of Christ for us. Let me ask this Writer whether there is not as much Need to be put in Mind of Charity, Patience, Contentment, and all other Christian Virtues as Humility? If so, this must be done in the proper Method which is not to make as many Sacraments as there are Graces to be attained.

But as to the Instances now before us, it is plain they are different, as *Light* from *Darkness*. The Reader (I hope) will excuse it, if I *Re-capitulate*, what hath been already Urg'd so far; as to make a Comparison between them. The Sacrament of the Lords Supper was Instituted by Christ himself, and commanded to be done in Remembrance of him (as St. Paul saith) till he come. The Washing one anothers Feet was never designed as a religious Institution, or binding Action, nor any Period assigned for its Continuance.

The First was plainly complied with by the Apostles and abundance of Rules laid down for our Behaviour before and at its Reception.

The Last was never (as we can find) practis'd by the Apostles; from whence it is plain, they never thought it commanded in the Words mentioned.

The one is declared the Bond of our Union among ourselves; and the Means of the *Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*.

The other as it was never complied with by the Apostles, so neither are there any *Benefits* annex'd to the Use of it in Scripture. He therefore that can make these Instances *parallel*, may make use of the *same Argument*, from the greatest *Contrarieties in Nature*.

My Examiner having thus far gone on, in one continued Strain of *Shuffling and Overlooking my Arguments*; let us now see what fine Work he makes with St. Paul 1. Cor. II. 23. &c. And first, he sees no *Necessity of believing* that Apostle received a new Revelation about Christ's last Supper. What are we to do now? St. Paul declares expressly he receiv'd it of the Lord: If so, I am sure it must be a new Revelation; and yet my Examiner tells no *Necessity of believing it*. The only Question is, who is to be believ'd first, he or the Apostle? But if you will not be too quick upon him, he hath something to offer, why he doth not believe it; "Because there could be no need of an Immediate Revelation, of so late a Fact, so well witnessed by the Disciples; and that therefore he might have it, only mediately from the Lord Jesus, but immediately from them." But let the Fact be never so well witnessed, yet if St. Paul saith in plain Words, he did receive what he deliver'd from the Lord: for my part I shall make bold to believe him still, in the proper Sense of his Words; and so I suppose will every honest Reader.

But such Sort of arguing as this, is the Top of my Examiner's Performance: If he discovers that St. Matth. doth not say *all* of a thing, that St. Luke doth; nor St. Mark so much as St. Paul; or that St. John gives but a *Transient Touch* of it: This shall be display'd and flourish'd with, as if it would bear down plain Matter of Fact; as enough to overthrow the direct Affirmations of the holy Penmen, and the indisputable Practice of the Apostles. So here, because the Fact happened lately, and was well witnessed, therefore (forsooth) we must not understand St. Paul as he writes; but conclude (tho without any tolerable Ground) that he received it not from the Lord, but the Apostles. His Ingenious and Worthy J. Lock is directly against him here also; who paraphrases the Words thus: *That which I receiv'd from himself*. What might not a Man do with the Word of God, that would

(64)
would allow himself *such a Liberty* as this? when it is said that *Jesus said so or so, or commanded this, or that*. He might answer, *I see no Necessity* to believe that *Jesus said it, or commanded it*; since he might either speak or command it *not immediately of himself, but immediately by the Apostles*. In short, he ought to shew that the plain obvious Meaning of the Words, is inconsistent with some other Place of Scripture; or else Words must be taken in their common and literal Construction: whereas he is so far from being able to do that, that the Apostle declares expressly 2. Cor. 12. 7. he had received *Abundance of Revelations*.

The Reader perhaps may wonder, why any one should offer such a *weak and groundless Interpretation*; but he was forced to it, to support his own *senseless Assertion*. For if our Lord made a *new Revelation* to St. Paul about the Manner of his Instituting this Sacrament, and repeated the Command for its Observance, after his Ascension into Heaven: 'Tis evident it was designed for a longer Time than the present one, in which he himself communicated with his Apostles. The contrary to which my Examiner hath had the Confidence to *Print, and Reprint* and which we shall see whether he will *Print again* when he writes next.

He observes secondly, that St. Paul doth not enjoin them the Observance of that Supper as a perpetual standing Ordinance, but leaves it with an Indifferency as to future Practice: and pray what Occasion was there to Command what our Lord himself had Commanded before? He recites the Words of the Institution at large, which he tells them he received of the Lord: He subjoyns the Command added for its Observance; and tells them that by complying with it, they did shew the Lords Death till he come. And now let any honest Reader judge, whether this is leaving it with an Indifferency as to future Practice. As to his Little Stolen Wit, it is sufficient to say; I never produced St. Paul's own Words as a Command: I said expressly p. 46. that he evidently Supposes it to be often administered. And cannot this Writer distinguish between a Command and a Supposition? Or did he think it necessary to dissemble that Knowledge, because he had nothing to Reply, unless he had invented this *paustry Fiction*? This Supposition then of St. Paul's, plainly describes the Practice of the first Christians, to wit, that they did receive it as an *Annunciation of the Death of Christ*: Whether the Word

Often
pute
receiv
goest
not
Suppo
absur
to the
St. P
He
Supp
then
fits v
mabl
mem
shoul
it. E
must
and
plain
Truly
but r
pose, a
printed
shall
In the
all th
sing b
Fou
theref
be un
stance:
to conf
and he
Apost
tals, y
they l
own
I sup
Substa
of the
to the
St. P
prete
Christ
Often

Often will bear the Stress I lay upon it, I need not dispute; because it may be proved from other Texts they did receive often: And so if he should say, as often as thou goest to London call upon thy Brother Lesly: Tho' it is not a Command to go thither; yet it depends upon the Supposition that I do go to London; otherwise the Saying is absurd and ridiculous: which tho' we can easily allow to this Writer, yet we cannot, without Impiety, allow to St. Paul.

He observes thirdly, That the Apostle makes this Supper to be but a shewing the Lord's Death: Doth he then make a But at this? Let me tell him, the Benefits we receive from his Death, are so great and inestimable; that if this Action was instituted only in Remembrance of that transcendent Act of Love, we should be the vilest of Creatures if we did not observe it. But what Argument doth he bring to prove, we must not shew the Lord's Death by eating this Bread and drinking this Cup? for this is what the Apostle plainly declares the Design of the Institution to be? Truly he hath not one Word to answer for himself: but runs off into a Question, nothing to the present Purpose, and asks: Where had the Priest the Notion, of its being appointed a standing Means of Grace, in the Christian Church? I shall answer him to this likewise in its proper Place. In the mean time I appeal to the Reader whether in all the Books he hath read, he ever saw such Shuffling before.

Fourthly, till he comes. Which (saith he) may (and therefore must this is one of his prime Arguments) be understood thus: Use the Ceremony, till you enjoy the Substance: Practice the outward Supper, till our Lord Jesus Christ comes, to confirm you to the End, &c. And you sup inwardly with him and he with you. Here we have the plain Words of the Apostle all spirited away at once. It we, benighted Mortals, who understand Phrases in their native Sense, as they lie before us; think fit to comply with our Lord's own Appointment; they will not condemn us: (Pity us. I suppose they do, as Persons who are not come to the Substance) whereas their enlightened Souls, have no Need of the Shadow; and therefore since Scripture is to truckle to the Light within, the secondary Rule to the Primary; St. Paul's plain Words, till he comes; must be interpreted till he comes within you: Just as the Death of Christ, and Resurrection, were interpreted of his dying with-

within and rising within us: But to stay no longer upon this Matter, I desire my Examiner, to give a direct Answer, to one fair Question, when he writes next: And that is; whether the Apostles were (as he phrases it) *come to the Substance or not*? That they did use (what he calls) *the Shadow*, or the *outward Elements* of Bread and wine, is evident: either therefore he must affirm, that they were not *come to the Substance*, and the *Quakers* are; otherwise (if we follow their Example) we (altho' we are come to the Substance) must use *the Shadow*, as they manifestly did. I hope he will not have the Face to answer, as I need not tell him who did: That *the Apostles were low and carnal in their Days*, and we see beyond them.

I'll venture to call this Interpretation *Thomas Beaven's last Shift*; for certainly a Man who had any Possibility of escaping otherwise; would never have made such an *Inglorious Retreat*.

The next Leap he takes, is to my 48 p. But I must inform him, there is that in the 47 which requires his Admirer's version. I leave the Reader to see what he hath there given up as indefensible, and shall only remind him of that Text, 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. *The Cup of Blessing, which we bless; is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? For we being many, are one Bread, and one Body; for we are all Partakers of that one Bread.* From hence then I affirm, That this is appointed a *Means of Grace in the Christian Church*: For that which Communicates to us the Body and Blood of Christ is certainly a *Means of Grace*: But this Bread and Wine Communicates to us the Body and Blood of Christ; therefore I conclude it a *Means of Grace*. And if we are by this Action to shew the Lord's Death *till he comes* (or to the end of the World, which is the Expression in relation to Baptism) then I hope it is likewise a *standing Means of Grace in the Christian Church*. And indeed I am afraid my Examiner apprehended the Force of these Words because he passed them over without Notice. The Text is so pressing, and the Apostolical Practice so evident from it (for it is said *we are all Partakers of this one Bread*) that even *this Writer* was not hardy enough to venture at a Reply. But the inquisitive Reader will easily discover, by his *Tricking and Shifting*, that this is far from being the only Proof, that he writes against the *full Convictions of his own Conscience*.

Upon

(67)
Upon my desiring him, to *Ruminate upon the Dignity of this Holy Ordinance* imply'd in the great Guilt of an *unworthy Reception*: He entertains us with a long *Story about Carolina*; which I could *overmatch* with another about *Pensilvania*; but that I know the Reader will *laugh at it*, as nothing to the Purpose. But he afterwards informs us, that this is what we are to learn, by what the Apostle says about an *unworthy Reception*: *That this Ceremony, that was then observed with Respect to Christ, (tho' without a Commandment) should be perform'd by Holy Persons; else they that use it are condemned*

Whether I have not *prov'd it commanded*, let the Reader judge: And that it was then *observed with Respect to Christ he acknowledges*; and I must farther tell him they had the *strangest Obligations* to that Observance; as it was instituted and commanded by Christ himself, own'd as such by the Apostle, who repeats the very Words of that Institution and Command, as *Received of the Lord*: Declared also to be a *Shewing forth his Death, and a Communion of his Body and Blood*: And an *unworthy Reception* of it said to be, the *not Discerning his Body*; and consequently a just Provocation for God, to visit so heinous a Sin: *Self Examination* prescrib'd *before we receive*; and such an humble Demeanour while we Communicate, as may shew we do not *Dispise the Church of God, and the Body and Blood of Christ*. Can we think then that our Lord and his Apostles have *done and revealed* all this, to *no End and Purpose*? To leave us *at Liberty as to future Practice*? Or that the idle Suggestion, that *πρωτον* may be understood *Indicatively* as well as *Imperatively*, is sufficient to overthrow plain Scripture? Or that the slender Pretence, that they who *have the Substance* have *no need of the Sign*: (a Pretence when compared with the Scripture found to be *as void of Truth as Modesty*) Can stand the Test against a divine Institution and Command, supported with the universal Practice of the First, and succeeding Ages of Christianity? certainly this can never enter into a *Head that bath Brains, or a Heart that bath Integrity*.

To return then to my Examiner: These Texts of St. Paul do plainly imply, that this Sacrament *ought to be received*; as well as that the Persons who receive it, *ought to be holy*. And as to his next Question, What we are to think of the *many Debauched Persons of the Clergy and Laity, who partake of it not discerning the Lords Body*? Tho' it is foreign to his Business; yet the Answer is *ready*; That if *there are*

many such, St. Paul hath told them *their Doom*,. And yet I must acquaint this Writer, That he of all Men ought only to stand upon the *Defensive*; and not Attack either *Clergy* or *Laitie* in such a *general and undistinguishing Manner*: because let him fix upon whom he will, when they come fairly to *ballance the Account*, it is well, if he doth not appear the *most profligate Person* of them all.

But my Examiner returns on a sudden to my 44 p. having received, I suppose, some *new Assistance* from the Learned; and tells me, I Impose upon my Reader in blaming him, for rendring those Words in the Original, Heb. 9. 10. by *Divers Baptisms*, instead of *Divers Washings*. But I gave him my Reason, That Baptism was now a *Word of Art*, and appropriated to a *peculiar Sense among Christians*. He demands *who made it so*? If I could hope to Convince him, I would answer in his own Language; *Custom and Usage* which gave birth to the *Signification of Words*, and the same is the *Governour thereof*: and if Custom hath determined the Sense of the *English Word Baptism* to one *particular Action*; then, I hope, it must not be applied to *Washings* indifferently. We have an Account, Mark 7. 4. of the βαπτισμῶν ποτηρίων &c. But certainly we ought to understand the *English* a little better, than to translate it, the *Baptism of Cups and Pots, Brazen Vessels, and of Tables*. So that his little Reading in the Greek, stands him in no stead here (which by the way, I believe he reads, as many a poor Culprit doth his Neck-Verse, without understanding it) since the Question is not what the Words signify in Greek, but how they are to be rendred in *English*: For tho' to *Baptize* and to *Wash* are Words of the same Import, in the *Original*; yet it by no means follows, that they are to be used *intiscriminately in our own Language*: The contrary to which is plainly evident, from the Instance already given; as also from that I gave before, of the *Impropriety* in saying, we have been *Baptizing our Hands*. Our Author then should understand the *Force of Words* a little better, before he enters into these Arguments: For tho' any learned Man may make use of such a Phrase to shew, that all Baptism in the *Notion* of it includes *Washing*; yet no one can use it (as my Examiner hath done) to shew, that all *Washing* doth in the *Notion* of it include *Baptism*: The plain Reason of it is, because the *Terms* are not convertible; since Baptism (as I told him) is now appropriated to a *peculiar Sense among Christians*. I do therefore humbly move that
the

the English Translation may yet stand uncorrected, notwithstanding this Writer's *learned Criticism*.

But he cannot bear such an Expression as a *Word of Art*; because he is for *naked Truth without Art*. An Innocent, Harmless Creature, I warrant him! without the least Guile or Tricking! witness his late worthy Performances! he was so desirous the Reader should know this, that he was forc'd to introduce it with a *Pun* upon the Word *Art*: Which he takes for *Deccit*, tho' it is plainly taken by me, for a *Term made use of in any Art or Science*. So that this Piece of his Wit, may be placed in the *next Edition of the Quakers Quibbles*; and as to his objecting against *the Thing*; I must acquaint him, that these Terms are so necessary in *all Arts*, that I cannot but fancy some are appropriated even to the *very Art of Drugget-Making*.

I need not be long in summing up the Arguments upon this Head; because they are in Substance the same, with those concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, let it suffice briefly to observe, that all his Reasoning from the Jewish Passover is to be laid aside, as an Amusement: Since we ground our Obligation to Celebrate the Lord's Supper from its being instituted and ordained by Christ himself; and not from any Rite of the *Jews*.

Hither likewise must be brought his Instance of our Lords Washing his Disciples Feet, and saying to them, *Ye ought to Wash one anothers Feet*: A Custom of that Country, which was never designed for a Religious Action; which the Apostles (who were certainly the most competent Judges) never afterwards did perform; as knowing our Lord never intended to oblige them to it; which had no time assigned for its Continuance; nor any Benefits annexed to the use of it.

What directly concerns this Subject is, The Institution and Command of our Lord. The First he hath wholly overlook'd; pretending it to be the *Jewish Passover*. The last he endeavours (tho' in Vain) to evade, first by saying it had Relation *only to that time*: Which Sense I have shewn to be both absurd and impossible, when compar'd with other Places in Scripture.

Secondly, By a foolish Criticism, which (I hope) I have likewise effectually confuted.

His Comments upon St. Pauls Writings on this Subject, are *one continued Strain of Shuffling and Prevarication*; as the Reader (I doubt not) is by this time sensible; I will

will therefore address my self to him again in the Words of my Reflections on this Head.

Let him sit down and consider seriously the solemn Accounts of this Institution Recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, and St. Luke and the Command added for its Observance ; let him reflect also upon the new Revelation imparted to St. Paul concerning it, and his declaring this Rite to be a shewing forth the Lord's Death till he comes : Let him ruminate upon the Dignity of this Holy Ordinance, imply'd in the great Guilt of an unworthy Reception ; and the blessed Communication of the Merits of Christ's Body and Blood, which it exhibits to all who receive worthily. and then let him try, how he can possibly reconcile the high and important Ends of its Appointment, with its being but a bare Jewish Rite, or having no Place in the Christian Dispensation.

We are now come to another Scene of this Writer's Performance, his *Vindication of his learned Quotations* : And indeed (to do him Right) he hath been careful through the *whole Contexture of his Work*, that the Reader shall not want *Entertainment*. The Method that I took to answer them, was to shew out of the *very Author's* he quoted, that they were all Persons who held abominable Doctrines : Some of which I mention p. 50, 51. and refer to the Places, where a full Account may be seen of their *impious Tenets*. To this he replies first ; it is no wonder I should call them *Hereticks*, since I cannot forbear calling the Quakers so ; who have fairly cleared themselves of such Imputations, in their *Switch for the Snake*, &c. But I must tell him, the Switch hath come far short of what he affirms. The Monster is too ugly and deform'd to be lick'd again into shape : and the horrid Impieties in their Books, are too plain and legible ; to have any Relation to Christianity. If any doubt of this, I only desire them to read the *Snake and the Switch together*, and compare the Quotations and Answers ; which is a short Way to be quickly satisfied. And I must farther add, that our *modern Quakers* cannot be thought by indifferent Men fairly clear of these *Imputations* ; till they have given up the Cause of those *wicked Wretches*, who vented such rank *Blasphemies* among us, as Indefensible.

But to Return.

How doth he wipe off the particular Charges which I had made against his Evidence ? Why truly he tells me, I must shew him Books that I can prove were written by the Persons *charg'd* ; wherein they themselves

own

own these Errours ; or else he is not bound " to take " the Articles of their Faith from their Adversaries." And so at one Blow, all the *Fathers of the Church*, and *Ecclesiastical Historians* are discarded ; and must be set aside, as Men not fit to be believ'd or trusted : and which is the Mischief of all, this mighty *Atchievement* is to be perform'd, by that *Man of Credit* Thomas Beaven Jun. and no one for the future, is to be counted an *Heretick* after his Death, unless he hath been graciously pleas'd, to give in a Catalogue of his Heresies under his own Hand. Now I always thought the Civilians Rule had a Foundation in Reason as well as Law : *Qui Testem adducit pro se, Idem tenetur accipere contra se* ; He that brings any one as an Evidence for him is bound to admit his Evidence against him. Accordingly I proceeded in the old common Method : I consulted some of the Authors he referr'd me to, and shew'd him what a blessed Character they gave of these Persons he produc'd in his Favour. But this (it seems) is of little Credit, and of a Piece ; If Irenæus is for him, then he is for Irenæus : but if he is against him he is resolv'd to be even with him, and be against him too : And then nothing less will serve, but a Book that I can prove was written by the *Hereticks themselves*.

And now Reader what Course is to be taken with such a merry Disputant ? Here are several of his former Quotations reprinted, but if I should examine the Authors he cites, and shew this Part of his Evidence, to be no better than his former ; yet still he hath me plainly upon the old Lock, and will not believe his own Authors.

I must therefore try another Sort of Argument, which I declare before hand is the most Foolish that ever appear'd upon Paper : And yet I am not out of Hopes, but it may have some Effect upon my Examiner because it is his own.

His first reprinted Authority is from Theodoret ; who mentions some, that said, there is no Profit accruing to the Baptiz'd by Baptism : But my Answer to this is ready : That I am not bound to take the Articles of their Faith from Theodoret : This My Adversary knows is not just. Let him then produce any Book, that he can prove was written by Dadoes, Sabbas, &c. that contain these Errors if he can, but till he doth that. I must beg his Pardon, if I do not believe their Adversary.

OF as little Credit are his Quotations from *Dacherius*, *Pithæus*, *Everaninus*: of a Piece with which, are those from the *Abbot of Clugny*, *Ecbertus*, and *Reinerius*. In short, nothing is to Convince me; but Books containing these Tenets, which he can plainly prove, were written by the Persons themselves, who are said to hold them. And is not this a pleasant Man, and of a good modest Assurance, who can urge such an Argument, as instead of destroying my Answers, destroys his own Authorities!

As I make use of this only, to convince my Examiner of his weak and ludicrous Manner of Arguing; so the Reader (I hope) will forgive me; especially since it is a Method prescrib'd by the Wiseman, *Prov. 26. 5.* to answer a Fool according to his Folly.

His next Endeavour is an Imposition upon his Reader, as it I fell upon him, for spelling the Name of a Place wrong: Whereas what I reprimanded him for, was his Self-Conceitedness, in presuming to refine upon Mr. Wall (whose Book he had before him) and give his Author the Name of *William of Newbery* (which I only made *Newbury* as it ought to be wrote) whereas if he had but seen the Author he quotes, and could have understood him, he must have discover'd he took his Name from *Newborough* a Monastery in *Yorkshire*.

But I told him, I had another thing to talk with him about, which would stick closer to him, and that was, his mangling Mr. Walls Quotation, and dealing so dishonestly with his Reader, as to conceal one Part of it, which, if produced, would have destroy'd the Credit of his Evidence. And now, what Reply doth he make to this, which is certainly the most Material thing to be spoke to? he hath not so much as one Word in Defence of himself, but leaves his Reputation to the Charity of all good natur'd Christians.

What he attempts next, is equally worthy of the Author. He affirms it to be common Acceptation, to call a Bible printed at Holland in our own Language a *Dutch Bible*. Now tho' I can allow him to call the Print of such a Bible, a *Dutch Print*; yet I am sure, if it is in the *English Language*, it must unavoidably be an *English Bible*; and none but one of an *Irish Understanding* will say the Contrary; tho' after all, this Bible (according to the Account which he gives us) is such a Rarity that I should be glad if he would lend me the Book, it

it is (it seems) *a Bible printed at Holland*. Now I must confess, I have seen Books, printed at *Amsterdam*, at *London*, *Oxford*, and *Cambridge* : but I never yet saw a Book printed at *Holland*, or at *England*. Let not my Examiner call this a *petty Quarrel* ; for I must acquaint him, that when Men *set up for Authors* ; the least that is expected from them is, that they should know how to express themselves *properly and intelligibly* : and not blunder on without *Fear or Wit*, after such a ridiculous Manner.

He insists still upon his *Parity of Reason*, drawn from the Disuse of outward Circumcision, to the Disuse of outward Baptism. Tho' I have shewn so plainly, that as our Lord *never Commanded* the former, so he hath as *evidently enjoin'd* the latter : and that it is the only Means left us, whereby we are entitled to *the Baptism of the Spirit*. But having spoke already so largely to this Point, I can only refer the Reader to what is there said : For some Men are so resolute, that they will still *keep the Field*, tho' they are sure to *receive nothing but Blows*.

But why should my Examiner bear so deep a Grudge against Logick, as to call it the *Jargon of the Schools* ; which serves rather to *confound a Man's Sense*, than to *edifie his Soul*. I always thought Reason very serviceable to Religion ; and I am sure Logick is nothing else, but the *Art of Reasoning truly* : Indeed if Men have a Design to shuffle, and prevaricate in their Books ; and impose *Falshood for Truth* upon their Readers ; and lead them into Error under the specious Pretence of *edifying their Souls* : Logick will lay open the *Cheat*, and unvail these Pretences, and prove a mortal Enemy to such *wicked Writers*. If Men endeavour to cover their *Pride and Enthusiasms*, under the sacred Name of the *Spirit of God* ; and obtrude upon us their own *distracted Notions* (which are as so many *Ignes Fatui*, or *Wills in the Wisp*) for the *Candle of the Lord*, and the *Light within* : Then indeed Logick steps in, and by comparing these *arrogant Claims* with the Word of God, quickly *exposes* such *brain-sick Undertakers*. Upon the whole then, it is to be fear'd, my Examiner's *great Malignity* against Logick, hath the same Foundation, with that against *Synods*, the *Fathers*, and *Doctors*, which is ; that all of them are *declar'd Enemies to his Cause* : He that can quote such *Evidence* from their Writings, that another Man would be *asham'd to produce* in his Behalf : We may be sure would
not

not fail to let us know it, if he had any thing better to urge for himself; and it is worth Observation, that as much as he would seem to *deride Logick*, he can call upon me p. 24. for a *Categorical Answer*. In short, the true Reason why his *Invectives* against all these are so canker'd, is this: Because as long as *Synods*, or *Fathers*, or *Doctors*, or *Reason*, to which I will add, or the *Scriptures* have any Authority among us, his *shameless Presences* will be hiss'd at, and exploded.

In the last Paragraph he asks me, what I think of the several Particulars, taken out of *de Laune* in Relation to the Fathers? My Thoughts are, That *de Laune* hath abus'd them in many Instances: Tho' I must tell him I never intimated, that all was to be taken for Truth which they say. I know they were Fallible as well as we: and that some actually fell into Error: But I know also that many of them were Men of the strictest Piety: That Christianity shone in their Time with a Brightness, that I fear we shall never behold in ours: and that they counted all things but Loss for the Sake of Christ: divers of them actually suffering the Loss of all things, and patiently enduring the most exquisite Tortures. And therefore, how little Credit soever my Examiner may think fit to allow to the Writings of these holy Men; because they all condemn his Tenets: Others (notwithstanding their Failings) will know their Value; so that if he is dispos'd to imitate the little venomous Animal, he may swell, and swell, and burst, if he pleases: But he will never be able to sully the Glory, of these Worthies of the Christian Church.

Of the Hat and Language.

HAVING already exceeded the Length I intended for this Answer, I shall but just touch upon the following Particulars: since the placing any Religion in refusing the *Salutation of the Hat*, or observing a particular Mode of Speech, is so very Ridiculous, that an ordinary Capacity will see through it, at the first View. To compare this to the *Worship of Images* (which is down right Idolatry) is like the rest of this Writer's Performance: who knows, that we only use it as a civil Mark of Respect, and not on a Religious Account: and also that the Method of paying these Marks of Respect varies according to the Country where we live

ve. This is certain from the Word of God, That our Superiours are to be honoured; and it is as certain, that we must pay them this Honour in all *Lawful Instances*, and that nothing but *sinful Compliances* can be excepted. We read that the Jews in Divine Worship were cover'd, as a Mark of their *Subjection to God Almighty*: Others thought it more comely to be *uncover'd*, as the *Greeks*: which St. Paul thought fit likewise to approve (not as an Honour appropriated to the Worship of God) but as a Token of *the Man's Superiority*: as the Woman's being cover'd, was to be a Token of *her Subjection*. And the Reasonableness of our conforming to it, doth not only arise from this Declaration of St. Paul; but also, because it is certainly requisite, that what is accounted *honourable among Men*; should be given in the most humble and awful Manner to God Almighty. To our Superiours only as an Instance of *civil Regard*: But to God as a *solemn Circumstance of our Worship and Adoration*.

But then to make our Submission to this civil Action, which is in it self naturally indifferent, a criminal Matter; when it is only required of us, because it is a customary Mark of Respect, in the Country where we live; and therefore ought to be given to our Superiours: Nay to say with my Examiner, That it is *giving of God's Glory to another*; when it is evident we do not give it as any *Adjunct of Worship*; but purely as an Instance of *common Civility*: To say this, is to affirm what hath not the *least Foundation in the Word of God*; and doth indeed shew the *Affirmer*, to have a very *squeamish Conscience*, which is under the Conduct of a very *shattered Understanding*. Let him therefore either prove, that this Distinction is not well founded; or else he stands evidently condemn'd, in refusing this Mark of civil Respect to his Superiours.

With Reference to Language, he calls upon me to shew, that the Customary Way of speaking, was the Custom of the Times when the Scriptures were wrote. To which I will join, what he says above, that *the Salutation of the Hat was not in Use in the Apostles Time*: and so (it seems) in our civil Concerns, we must not pull off our Hats, or use any Form of Speaking; but what the Apostles us'd. If my Examiner desires it, I will give him one Reason, why the Apostles did not pull off their Hats: And that is; Because they had no Hats to pull off:
so

So that if he hath a Mind to be dress'd *Apostolically*, the best Advice that I can give him, will be to send for a *Turban*, and the rest of the *Eastern Habits*, by the next *Turkey Fleet*: And I verily believe, he will then be the *Wonder of the Age* for his *Garb*; as much as he is now for his *Integrity*. But to return, where doth he shew it to be our *Duty*, to keep strictly to the *Dialect* of the *Scriptures* at all, much less in our *common Conversation*? He hath not offer'd at one *Prooff* of this; and yet would have us submit to his bare *Affirmation*.

His next Argument against the plural Language is, Because *Great Men* have been flatter'd in it. But will not all this be *Retorted* upon him? What doth he think of their *great Founder's* having *Adoration* paid him in the *singular Number*? Or of *John Audland's* Letter to him? I hope he himself will own it *Flattery* at least, and I'll venture to call it *wicked Blasphemy*. What then are we to do? since there hath been *Flattery* in the *singular Number*, as well as in the *Plural*; and it can't be prov'd that the *Nature of this Corruption* is chang'd? We must even *sew up our Mouths*, and turn all publick *Conversation* into *Mumchance*, and *silent Meetings*.

The Reader will pardon a little *Levity* upon such a Subject: For I declare I am almost *asham'd* to answer such *Trifles*, as this Writer is not *asham'd* to urge, and that with so much *Confidence*, as if they were evident to a *Demonstration*.

He would have it thought an *Act of Self-Denial* in the sincere Quaker to deviate from *Custom* in these things. To this I reply'd, that without doubt, to see a Person rushing into a Room among his *Betters*, like an *Engine* upon *Screws*; *Thee-ing* one, and *Thou-ing* another, with his *Hat* upon his *Head*; must be a wonderful Instance of *Condescension* and *Self-denial*; and approve him a *Follower of Jesus* and his *Disciples*. This he calls a *wonderful Answer*! Let it be as wonderful as it will, it is a proper one: and I must tell him farther, that if *Pride*, *ill-Manners*, and *awkward Behaviour*, will pass for *Self-denial*; it must be own'd some People have it in *Perfection*. But I must shew that this was not the *Practice of Christ* and his *Apostles*; what to *Rush into a Room* among their *Betters*, &c.? That's easily done, if it was any thing to the *Purpose*: Tho' I must acquaint him, that it lies upon him to shew, that we are command'd to imitate *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, in such indifferent things, as *Forms of Salutation* and *Modes of Speech*; and

and that we are not at Liberty in these Instances, to comply with the Ways of our Country. If he cannot produce a plain Command for this (which he hath not so much as attempted, the Texts which he afterwards asserts having not the least Relation to his Subject) then, to place any Religion in a Noncompliance with these things, is not only an Affront to Superiours; but that very Sin, which he hath so vainly endeavour'd to fix upon us; I mean downright Superstition.

But if the Scriptures will not bear him out, in this Retrograde Behaviour to his Superiours; he thinks he can be even with us; and shew that we are Followers of the Pope. And pray in what is it? Why in our Rose-Hatbands, and little Bands about our Necks; our black Coats under, and white Coats a-top; resembling the Saints without, and the Devil within. O Moderation, whether wilt thou! What make Devils of us all, Bishops and Clergy, because we wear a Garment of a black Colour! You may be sure the poor Wretch is almost suffocated with Spleen and Vapours, when such an Occasion as this can transport him to use such blessed Language. Now I must confess, 'tis the first Time that ever I heard, his Holiness wears a Rose-Hatband, or a little Band about his Neck; or a black Coat under, and white One a-top: and if he doth not; then all this only shews, that the Ignorance of this Writer is equal to his Malice: as it plainly is, in the several Instances following: Where he outages many of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Establish'd Church, which were in being long before Popery, and which we can prove are so far from being sinful, that they are requisite for Decency and Edification. But as these particulars are only set down to draw me away from the present Controversie: So if any Reader desires Satisfaction, I must refer him to the numerous Tracts which have been published on these Heads.

In his second Paper, where he is forc'd to become an Advocate again for his petticoat Fathers, upon whom he had Satyriz'd so severely before; He recommended a Paraphrase to us (as speaking in their Favour) under this advantageous Character. A valuable Piece, wrote by the ingenious and worthy J. Lock, where this Matter is set in a clear Light: as he supposes, all who read the same will own. When I turn'd to this Author, I must confess, I could not forbear blushing for my Examiner, to see him assert a thing with so much Confidence, which is directly false: The Person

Person he quotes, giving his Opinion, positively against *their Womens Preaching*: for tho' he owns that Women did sometimes speak; in the first Ages of Christianity, when they were mov'd immediately, and extraordinarily of the Holy Ghost; yet he likewise asserts, that in ordinary Cases the Women in the Churches were not to assume the Personage of Doctors, or speak there as Preachers; Nay they were not so much as to ask Questions there: and that this was forbidden by the Words of St. Paul. And now what Answer doth he return to this? He tells you p. 52. This seems a plain Confession, that their speaking in the Church is lawful, under such Qualifications. But what doth he say to justify himself for abusing Mr. Leake so scandalously, as to produce him for an Evidence for him, when he is plainly an Evidence against him? What truly as far as Silence gives Consent, he owns the Charge to the full: He doth not so much as attempt to clear his own Credit, which doth so plainly suffer: But barbarously exposes the *striv'd Infant* to the wide World without one Rag to cover its Nakedness.

The several Texts which he endeavours afterwards to press into their Service, are wholly foreign, and impertinently urg'd. For as no one doubts that the Holy Ghost was then miraculously Poured out upon them, as well as upon Men, according to the Prediction of Joel: So they were mov'd by Extraordinary and Immediate Inspiration without question, They might deliver themselves in the Assembly. They might also Labour with the Apostles and Assist them in the Gospel: But that they were ever look'd upon as *stated Preachers*, or *suffer'd as such*, I desire this Writer to prove. And indeed St. Pauls Words are so plain, that it is needless to insist longer on this Head, 1 Cor. 14. 34. *Let your Women keep silence in the Churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak.* The putting down the Words of the Text, as well as the whole drift of the Chapter, sufficiently discovers this Author's juggling in distinguishing here between a *Speaking to learn*, and a *Speaking to teach*: for if Women are to keep Silence, I hope that excludes all sorts of speaking: And yet if these Words were capable of such an Evasion, those in the 1 Tim. 2. 12. are not. For the Apostle says plainly, *I suffer not a Woman to teach, but to be in silence.* Let me seriously ask my Examiner, Whether the Shame of being Exposed in a little time doth not over ballance any wicked Pleasure he can take in thus perverting the Word of God? But perhaps he thinks

his Book will be sure to be read by *the Friends*, whereas mine possibly never may: And then it is no matter what becomes of *the Truth*, so he can keep them asleep in their *Delusions*.

The Account he gives of the Difference between the London and Bristol Prints, is so very improbable, that he can never hope it should gain Credit with his Reader. Any one who will be at the Pains to compare the two Papers, must quickly be sensible of this; the Alterations being very *Material*. I will only give one *Instance*, and leave the Reader to judge of the Rest. It is concerning the Controversy between him and the *Lavington Monthly Meeting*. The Bristol Paper declares, the Ground of his leaving the *Quakers* to be for the *Offences of one Monthly Meeting*: But the London Paper saith, it was for the *Offences taken at one Monthly Meeting*: So then (it seems) the Offences were taken, and not given. And can any one think that this was not a Force upon him, to publish such an *Alteration* as plainly contradicted his first Account? In short, they who consider his *Differing in his Relation*, as he came to different Places, may easily see, That the Friends look'd on him as a *Renegado*; were Resolv'd to have him *substantially Expos'd*, and make him *Run the Gauntlet*; in this only they alter'd the *Punishment*, That they lent him a *Rod*, and oblig'd the poor Man to *Whip himself*: No one would be so Charitable to *Lay on the Stroaks*; and thus he was forced to turn *Felo-de-se*, and become his own Executioner.

My Examiner is now come to that part of his Work which certainly requires all his Dexterity; and that is to *Reconcile himself with himself*. But what can a Man do, who hath the *impossible Task* upon his Hands, of washing the *Black-Moor white*? Though he had so positively affirmed before, That the Quakers Errours had lain before him for a considerable Time, with a single Eye to the Glory of God: yet he can now have the Face to Assert, That what he did was in *Hast and Rashness*, and while he was *Angry, Hurried, and Unsettled*.

I am able to speak something to this upon my own Knowledge, having been with him several times before the Publication of his first Paper: I saw it indeed in Manuscript at our first meeting, and found he had Resolv'd before, to leave the Quakers: And as to any Scruples in reference to his Communicating with the Church, he would offer his Doubts with *Calmness*, and upon
Dis.

Discourse declare himself satisfied; and seem'd indeed, to be the farthest of any Man from the Description he would now impose upon us.

One Expression he us'd more than once, which I am sure I shall never forget; and that was, *How shall I get Rid of this Spirit of Quakerism?* I comforted him under his present Apprehensions, and told him, that time would wear off that which Remain'd of it. But I must confess, I am Convinc'd by his late Actions, That that Spirit is to be dreaded more than I was aware of. When I think of him, I cannot help remembering that Instance of our Lord's; *Matt. 12. 43, &c. of the Return of the Spirit. who took seven other Spirits, more wicked than himself, and they entered in and dwelt there.* The Result, I leave to this Writer's Consideration. *The last state of that Man is worse than the first.*

His next Pretence that his second Paper was wrote, in *Coolness and Calmness of Mind* is to all Appearance, *as void of Truth.* He says his Sight and Senses were restor'd to him in good Measure in five or six Days. (I suppose at nine Days End he saw perfectly) But I appeal to all the Neighbourhood, whether there was any Room for cool or calm Thinking in that Time? Did not the Quakers haunt him continually with their Groans and Tears, that one would think there had been a *wild Irish Funeral?* And yet this was the Season, in which, he would persuade you, he consider'd things coolly and calmly, and receiv'd *Illumination and Conviction*; when it was plain, his Ears were perpetually grated with the *Din and Howling* of the Male and Female Friends.

As he hath confessed his Self-contradictions in Matters of Opinion; so I will not repeat them here; but recommend the 54. 55. p. of my Reflections, to any one, who desires *Thomas Beaven's Picture in Miniature*: And if he ever saw any thing like it in Print, I am mistaken: For to use my Examiner's own Words) he is therein doubtless the *Wonder of the Age*, and I believe any one might get considerably by him who would carry him about for a sight.

But as he seems to deny p. 11. that he hath contradicted himself in Matters of Fact, so I must account with him a little upon that Head; and I will do it upon what he hath affirm'd, of their Ministry, and Discipline in general.

He desires the Quakers to consider, *what a lamentable Condition and Confusion they are in, for Want of a Mini-*

Ministry Prudently and Scripturally appointed; a Thing he hath been Several Years Dissatisfy'd about; considering how many Poor, Ignorant, Brain-sick Fellows, and Petticoat-Fathers ramble about among them. His Heart trembles to think how vilely they have been impos'd on, with false Prophecies, by those Grand Impostors. Nay, and that the Looseness of their Notions and Government, should be the Occasion thereof. Here then we have a plain Matter of Fact affirm'd, That many Poor, Ignorant, Brain-sick Fellows, and Petticoat-Fathers ramble about among the Quakers; that they have been vilely impos'd upon with False Prophecies by these Grand Impostors: And that the Looseness of their Notions and Government, is the Occasion of this Lamentable Confusion. Let my Examiner then when he writes next reconcile this, with what he hath since said, That he cannot Join with any Society among whom the Divine Presence is more Gloriously Manifested; that their Way of Worship is the most Evangelical. Now I always thought, that God was the God of Order and not of Confusion: It for I am sure, That Way of Worship can never be the most Evangelical, where such Confusion Reigns.

In Relation to their Discipline, he affirms: That the Horrid Confusion and Tumult that now oftentimes happens there, will still continue to attend those Meetings: Such as Twenty or Thirty Speaking at a time; and a few Noisy strong Lung'd Fellows, so full Freight with Assurance, as to declare the Determination of the Holy Ghost; shall bear down all before them, to the loathing of Men of Sense. If this Fact be true; He is desired to reconcile it with, their Constitution of their Government as a People being doubtless the most Excellent of any Religious Society in the World, as suited to the Gospel Pattern.

But he is pleas'd to inform the Reader, that he designed all these Contradictions. Blatantly spoken Face and Feathers! and pray what must be thought of the Man, who can bring himself to form such Designs? Who can be of one Religion in October, and another in January: Nay can Print against the Quakers, and for the Quakers in that Compals of Time; and give himself the Lye in so many Particulars? If you urge him with this, to induce him to vindicate himself, you must not expect a fair Answer: He'll patiently bear all for Christ's Sake. And you may be sure this is no Patience per Force; by that Dove-like and Gentle Language which he hath through his own Book, bestow'd on the Church and Clergy;

G

where-

whereby he hath doubtless shewn himself a very *Thomas a Kempis*, or the *Christians Pattern*.

Upon the whole, the Charge that I fix upon my Examiner; and which I desire him to clear himself of, is this.

That he had found out the Truth after much Consideration, but had neither the *Courage* nor *Honesty* to stand to it.

That he hath wrote a *second Paper* in Contradiction to his first, which (I believe) the Reader now sees, he is not able to defend in *one Particular*, by *one solid Argument*, and therefore continues (in spite of Conviction) a *Poor, Despicable, Self-condemned Quaker*.

That his *pretended Repentance* is misplaced, there being *no need of it* in Respect to his first Paper; which contains such Truths as he can never overthrow: And therefore to profess Sorrow for that, and to plume himself upon his Second; is to Repent of what is *Honourable*; and to *Glory in his Shame*.

That the Shuffling and Prevarication which runs thro' his whole Defence, plainly discovers, that *Fear* and *Importunity* (if not something worse) drove him to his *Second Attempt*; and forc'd him to make the Friends that *abominable Offering of his Credit and his Conscience*.

His last Page may convince the Reader of his *good Intentions*, to throw some Dirt upon me if he could: All impartial Men will see, that there is but a *single Instance* that can be thought to deserve my Notice; tho' if he could have produc'd any *Thing else that was material*, without doubt he would have embrac'd with Greediness such a Gratification of his Malice. But after a *Ten Years Discharge of my Function in this Place*, I am able to shake this *Viper from my Hand Unhurt*.

One thing indeed he hath the Confidence to Assert in Print, which if it was true, we might then *Both of us* write, without the least Hopes of being read, or regarded: And that is, That I gave *so many Guineas for my Place*. But I thank God, I can solemnly affirm, the Charge to be *as false as it is wicked*. No Man having ever received a Post of this Nature, *more honourably than my self*; and that not only as it was free from those *Vile and Enormous Instances of Corruption*, which this Writer mentions; and which *even the Common Law would take hold of*: But also, as it was untainted with the *least Mixture* of any underhand, or indirect Practice. This I think *my self oblig'd* to declare, in Regard to others, as well as *my self*.

And

And now what Language can be *too severe* to be bestowed on this Man, who hath published *such a horrid Falshood* to the World; which (if true) would declare me *guilty of direct Perjury before my Bishop*, and *deprive me of my Benefice*. Is this *his breaking a Man's Head with a Feather*? And Writing with *that Temper and Moderation as becomes a Christian*? Had *any one else* publish'd this as Fact; I must confess it would have made *some Impression upon me*: Whereas I can now readily leave it with the Reader, being abundantly satisfy'd what *Credit his Assertions* meet with in the World. The *Vile Wretch* hath shewn indeed his *Eagerness to Fight*; but the best of it is, he had before taken Care, to *beat out his Teeth with his own Fist*.

But as I have been obliged in Vindication of my self, to put this Matter into a *publick Way of Examination*, as soon as the Rules of Law will admit of it: So I doubt not but it will then appear, this Writer hath *deliberately printed a wicked Untruth*, without the *least Proof* to support it.

If he desires to know the *Motive of my Undertaking against him*. It was because he had abus'd the Scriptures, and prostituted himself in such a scandalous Manner, as made it necessary to *shew him in his true Colours*. The Spots of his Leprosie were so thick and dangerous, that I was willing to prevent my *honest Neighbours from catching the Infection*; and my Success in it hath been such, as will Overballance the *Little Efforts* of his Spight and Malice.

In the rest of his Paragraph he either charges such Recreations on me *as Crimes*, which any Man may very *innocently use*; or else blames me for *not doing other Things*; to the Performance of which I am under *no Obligation*.

But this is the Man, who as our Lord hath express'd it; can *Strain at a Gnat, and Swallow a Camel*. To *pull off your Hat*, or *speak to a single Person in the plural Number*; to *play at Cards, or ride a Hunting*, are aggravated; as if they were the *Marks of the Beast*, the very *Limbs of Antichrist*: But to *play fast and loose with God Almighty*, and set his Sacred Name to *Contradictions*: To have a Conscience like a *Weather-cock*, that in *six Days time*, can point as directly contrary as *North and South*; to declare publicly for the Truth, and presently as publicly and shamefully desert it; and not be able to give *one sound Reason* for such Desertion (as indeed what Reason

son can be offered against the plain Declaration of the Word of God ?) all this (if you'll believe him) is purely in Obedience to God's Light in his Soul. But certainly the Person must be far gone in Phrensy, who can imagine God and Man are to be mocked at such a Rate.

And now if I could hope to do any Service to this Writer, I would lay before him *the State into which he is fallen*. But at present, I will only desire him to endeavour to form in his Mind, a *true Estimate of Reputation*. Let him consider it, as that for which the whole World is *too mean an Exchange*; as that which (when well founded) is an unmoveable Anchor of the Soul in *this Life*, and the happy Prognostick of a *Better*; as that in which *wicked Men* are desirous to live, but for which a *good Man* dares to die; as that which requires *much Time* to Raise and Establish it, *great Pains* to Cultivate and Secure it, and yet when *once it's Lost*, 'tis Lost for ever.

But I fear I am all this while at *Labour-in-Vain*; 'tis like *Whipping a Post*, or Dressing a Man's Wounds *after he is Dead*: The very Thought of it suggests to me those Lines of *Persius*, where I doubt my Examiner is too exactly described.

*Sed stupet hic Vitio, & fibris increvit Opimum
Pingue, caret Culpa, nescit quid perdat, & alto
Demersus, summâ rursum non bullit in undâ.*

In English thus,

But stupify'd with Crimes, his Conscience grows
Callous, and then he thinks *no Crime* he knows;
Careless of Reputation, takes his Leap,
And never Bubbles in th' inclosing Deep.

There is but *one Thing* remains for me to do, which I have purposely reserv'd for a Page or two at last. And that is, To Expostulate a little with this Writer about his *insufferable Treatment* of the Established Church, in Villifying her Sacraments, and Manner of Ordination, and most of her Rites and Ceremonies: One would think (if nothing else could prevail, yet) the Indulgence she *so generously gives to others*, ought to secure her from such *virulent Libels*. Some Regard certainly should be had to *Her Majesty*, who Adorns this Church with so *sir et a Conformity* and such an *Exemplary Picty*; and therefore to Insult it after this *Affronting Way*, is a very odd Method of shewing Respect to our Sovereign. If

If it is possible this can receive any *Aggravation*, it would be to suppose a Man, to keep her Accompts for near Fifty Thousand Pounds per Annum, and yet to be so *Brutishly Ungrateful*, as to Attack her thus in the Religion she professes.

Some Regard ought likewise to be had to the *Two Houses of Parliament*, from whose Clemency (in conjunction with Her Majesties) he enjoys his own *Liberty*. Whether it is a proper Return for such a Favour, to fly in the Face of the Constitution, or to call the Laws about Tyths, a *Popish Yoke*; let the Reader judge.

And let me tell him, whether he will receive it or not, some Regard ought to be had to the Clergy of this Church; who, taken together, are too considerable a Body of Men, both in Respect to their *Function* and *Families*, to be thus Vilified: Especially by one, who is but newly Transplanted from the hot Bed. But all this is, I suppose, to convince us, That he remembers the Respect due to his Superiors in the several Stations wherein God hath placed them.

He may satisfy himself, these *Poison'd Arrows*, return without any Effect, into his own Bosom. His Inclination to *Mischief* discovers it self from his bitter Words: But (to the Comfort of all honest Men) his Nails are pared, and nothing is to be feared from his *Slandrous Pen*.

And yet if he had lost all Sense of Honour to his Superiors, some Regard ought to be had to his own Father, who likewise professes himself a Member of this Church. But my Examiner rushes like a *Blind Horse into the Battle*, without Considering whether he Runs, or whom he Engages.

Perhaps the Reader may now expect I should Reckon with him, for his *Civilities to my self in particular*; but I shall only observe, That he is very desirous of placing me among the *High-Church-Priests*, and *High-Church-Parsons*. What he means by the Distinction, I leave him to tell us: Though (for my own Part) if to be Zealous in behalf of the Church, in every Branch of her present Constitution, deserves that Name; I am so far from disowning it, that I do Rejoice in it, and will Rejoice. But if my Examiner will not be Angry, I would ask him one short Question; and that is, Among what Party he hopes to hide his Head? I can assure him, Church-Men and Dissenters are entirely agreed in his Character, and are now willing to take him for what he is, upon Content.

I am obliged to do that Right to the Quakers themselves, as to declare, I never heard of, or met with one that endeavoured to defend him. And indeed to have such a Man of any Party, would be a Scandal to our Common Christianity. So that my Examiner had no Occasion to be so brisk upon me with his High-Church Distinction, which (as some People are pleased to affix the Character) comprehends such good Company, as no Man need be Asham'd or afraid to appear in. I say, he might have spared all this, if it had been only out of Respect to himself, whose late Actions are equally Disclaimed by all Parties. And therefore if any Person, into whose Hands this Tract shall fall, hath a Longing to behold the Man, who is the Scorn and Detestation of High-Church, of Low-Church, of the Presbyterians, the Anabaptists, nay of several of the Quakers themselves: If any one hath the Curiosity to see this Wonder of the Age, let him go and make a Visit to Thomas Beaven Jun^r

Melkesham, August 30.

1707.

ERRATA.

Page 6. Line 7. for come the, Read come to the. p. 15. l. 20. f. there, r. their. p. 16. l. 24. after trouble my self, add, in that Place. p. 25. l. 16. r. Baptism. p. 27. l. 1. f. are r. is. p. 28. l. 11. f. cau I, r. I can. p. 29. l. 7. r. peremptory. p. 33. l. 10. r. Baptism. p. 35. l. 25. r. Penmen. p. 37. l. 36. r. before and after. p. 38. l. 35. r. Æthiopian. p. 39. l. 8. r. Matt. 28. 19. l. 30. r. Baptized. p. 44. l. 37. r. Christ. p. 53. l. 4. r. Piece-meal. p. 54. l. 34. r. Decision. l. 36. r. eat it. p. 55. l. 45. r. unthought of. p. 57. l. 45. r. Interpretation. p. 63. l. 16. f. tells r. sees. p. 64. l. 2. r. Commanded. l. 38 and 39. r. administred. p. 76. l. 16. r. Flattery. In several Places for Sence, r. Sense. for wholly, r. wholly. and for Litteral, r. Literal.

The Author being distant from the Press, the Reader is desired to correct any other Mistakes which have happen'd in Spelling or Pointing.

F I N I S.







